CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation Chennai and eGangotri

2.1

THE AṢṬĀDHYĀYĪ OF PĀṆINI

WITH

Translation and Explanatory Notes

By

S. D. JOSHI

AND

J.A.F. ROODBERGEN

VOLUME III

(1.3.1 - 1.3.93)

SAHITYA AKADEMI

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy: Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

THE
AṢṬĀDHYĀYĪ
OF
PĀṆINI

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

THE AṢṬĀDHYĀYĪ OF PĀṆINI

WITH

Translation and Explanatory Notes

BY

S. D. JOSHI

AND

J. A. F. ROODBERGEN

VOLUME III

(1.3.1–1.3.93)

SAHITYA AKADEMI

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini Vol. III : Translation with explanatory notes in English of Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. by S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen
Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi (1994) Rs. 150

© Sahitya Akademi

First Edition 1994

SAHITYA AKADEMI

Head Office :

Rabindra Bhavan, 35, Ferozeshah Road, New Delhi– 110 001.
Sales Office : " Swati ", Mandir Marg, New Delhi 110 001.

Regional Offices:

' Jeevan Tara ', 23A/44X, Diamond Harbour Road, Calcutta– 700 053.
172, Mumbai Marathi Granth Sangrahalaya Marg, Dadar, Bombay– 400 014.
A. D. A. Rangamandira, 109, J. C. Road, Bangalore– 560 002.
304–305, Anna Salai, Teynampet, Madras 600 018,

Price : Rs. 150/–

ISBN 81 7201 781 2

Printer :

Vaidika Samshodhana Mandala Mudranalaya
Vedic Research Institute,
T. M. V. Nagar,
Pune– 411 037 (India)

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge our indebtedness to the authorities of the Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, for accepting our work on Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī as the publication of the Akademi.

We also wish to thank Mrs. Nalini Dhadphale, Secretary of the Vaidika Samshodhana Mandala, and Mr. D. B. Polkam of the Deccan College Dictionary Department for reading the proofs. Our thanks also go to Dr. Mrs. Ranjana Date, Mrs. L. S. Jagadale, Mrs. Manjari Kulkarni and Mrs. Vandana Selukar of the Deccan College Dictionary Department for preparing the Indices.

Deccan College
May 1994

S. D. Joshi
J. A. F. Roodbergen

My sincere thanks are due to the Netherlands Foundation for the Advancement of Tropical Research (WOTRO) for the grant awarded in 1993.

J. A. F. Roodbergen

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Translations, books and articles referred to

a. Translations

1. *Pāṇini's Grammatik.* Herausgegeben, übersetzt, erläutert and mit verschiedenen Indices versehen von O. Böhtlingk. Leipzing 1887. Nachdruck Hildesheim, 1964.

2. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.* Edited and translated into English by the late Śrīśa Chandra Vasu. Allahabad, 1891. Reprint. New Delhi, 1962.

3. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.* Roman Transliteration and English Translation by Sumitra M. Katre. Delhi, 1989.

4. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.* Volume II. English Translation of *adhyāya* I with Sanskrit text, transliteration, word-boundary, *anuvṛtti*, *vṛtti*, explanatory notes, derivational history of examples, and indices by R. N. Sharma. New Delhi, 1990

5. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.* With Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen. Volume I (1.1.1–1.1.75). Sahitya Akademi : New Delhi, 1991. Referred to as *AP* I.

6. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.* With Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen. Volume II (1.2.1–1.2.73). Sahitya Akademi : New Delhi 1992. Referred to as *AP* II.

b. Books

1. V. S. Agrawala, *India as known to Pāṇini.* Second Edition. Varanasi, 1963.

2. W. S. Allen, *Phonetics in Ancient India. London Oriental Series.* Volume 1. Oxford University Press. London, 1953.

3. *The Siddhāntakaumudī of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita.* with the *Bālamanoramā* commentary by Vāsudeva Dīkṣita. Second edition. Edited by C. Sankararama Sastri. Mylapore, Madras 1929.

4. *Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari* with the commentary of Helārāja. *Kāṇḍa* III, Part I. Edited by K. A. Subramania Iyer. *Deccan College Monograph Series.* Poona 1963.

5. *Vākyapadīya of Śrī Bhartṛhari.* Edited by K. V. Abhyankar and V. P. Limaye. *University of Poona Sanskrit and Prakrit Series.* Volume II. Poona 1965.

6. G. Cardona, *Pāṇini. A Survey of Research.* The Hague–Paris, 1976.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

7. S. D. Joshi–S. Bhate, *The Role of the Particle Ca in the Interpretation of the Aṣṭādhyāyī. Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.* Class B, No. 8, University of Poona. Pune, 1983.

8. S. D. Joshi–S. Bhate. *The Fundamentals of Anuvṛtti. Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.* Class B, No. 9. University of Poona. Pune, 1984.

9. P. Kiparsky, *Pāṇini as a Variationist.* Edited by S. D. Joshi. The MIT Press, Cambridge & London. Co-published by the Poona University Press. Pune, 1979

10. A. A. Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar. Encyclopedia of Indo-Aryan Research.* Vol. I, Part IV, Strassburg : K. J. Trübner, 1910.

11. G. B. Palsule, *The Sanskrit Dhātupāṭhas. A Critical Study.* University of Poona. Poona 1963.

12. Patañjali.

(a) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa–Mahābhāṣya. Samarthāhnika* (P. 2.1.1). Edited with Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.* Class C. No. 3, University of Poona. Poona, 1968. (*SA*)

(b) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa–Mahābhāṣya. Avyayībhāvatatpuruṣāhnika* (P. 2.1.2–2.1.49). Edited with Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi in collaboration with J. A. F. Roodbergen. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.* Class C, No. 5. University of Poona. Poona, 1969 (*ATA*)

(c) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Karmadhārayāhnika* (P. 2.1.51-2.1.72). Edited with Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.* Class C, No. 6, University of Poona. Poona. 1971. (*KA*)

(d) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa–Mahābhāṣya. Tatpuruṣāhnika* (P. 2.2.2–2.2.23). Edited with Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.* Class C, No. 7, University of Poona. Poona, 1973. (*TA*)

(e) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa – Mahābhāṣya. Bahuvrīhidvandvāhnika* (P. 2.2.23–2.2.38). Text, Translation and Notes by J. A. F.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Roodbergen. Edited by S. D. Joshi. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.* Class C, No. 7, University of Poona. Poona, 1974 (*BDA*).

(f) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa–Mahābhāṣya. Kārakāhnika* (P. 1.4.23–1.4.55) Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes by S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.* Class C, No. 10, University of Poona. Poona, 1975. (*KARA*).

(g) *Patañjaliś Vykāraṇa–Mahābhāṣya. Vibhaktyāhnika* (P. 2.3.18 2.3.45). Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes by S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.* Class C, No. 12, University of Poona. Pune, 1980. (*VIBHA*)

(h) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa–Mahābhāṣya. Paspaśāhnika.* Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes by S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.* Class C, No. 15. University of Poona. Pune, 1984. (*PASPA*)

(i) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa–Mahābhāṣya. Sthānivadbhāvāhnika,* Part I (P. 1.1.56–57). Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes by S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Pune, 1990. Referred to as *STHĀNI,* Pt. I.

The ms. of *Sthānivadbhāvāhnika,* Part II (P. 1.1.58–59) was finished in 1989, and is in the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute Press.

13. J. A. F. Roodbergen, *Mallinātha's Ghaṇṭāpātha* on the *Kirātārjunīya,* I–VI. Part I : Introduction, Translation and Notes. Leiden : E. J. Brill. 1984.

14. J. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik,* I. Lautlehre. Göttingen : Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1896.

15. J. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik,* Introduction générale par L. Renou. Göttingen : Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957.

16. W. D. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar.* Cambridge, Mass. : Harvard University Press. Second edition, 1889.

C. Articles

1. G. Cardona, Studies in Indian Grammarians, I : The method of description reflected in the Śivasūtras. *Transactions of the American Philosphical Society,* Vol 59.1. Philadelphia, 1969.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

2. C. Kunhan Raja, "The Śiva-sūtras of Pāṇini (an analysis)." *Annals of Oriental Research*, University of Madras, Sanskrit Section. Vol. 13. P. 65–81 Madras, 1957.

3. S. D. Joshi, "The Reflexive Construction in Pāṇini". *CASS Studies*. Number 6. University of Poona 1981, p. 205–208.

4. S. D. Joshi–P. Kiparsky, "Siddha and Asiddha in Pāṇinian Phonology", *Current Approaches in Phonological Theory*. Edited by D. A. Dinnsen. Indiana University Press. Bloomington and London, 1979, p. 223–250.

5. S. D. Joshi. "The Functions of *Asiddhatva* and *Sthānivadbhāva* in Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*", *CASS Studies*, Number 6. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit*. Class E, No. 8. University of Poona. Pune, 1981.

6. S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen, "The Structure of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* in Historical Perspective". *Proceedings of the International Seminar on Studies in the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Edited by S. D. Joshi and S. D. Laddu. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit*. Class E, No. 9. University of Poona. Pune, 1883, p. 59–95.

7. S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen, "On P. 1.1.56", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 105, 1985, p. 469–477.

8. S. D Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen, "On *siddha*, *assiddha* and *sthānivat*". *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*. Vol. LXVIII Poona, 1987, p. 541–549.

9. S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen, "The rejection of P. 1.1.58 : A confirmation of the exclusively positive aspect of *sthānivadbhāva*". *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*. Vol. LXIX. Poona, 1989, p. 217–28.

10. P. S. Filliozat, "The Pāṇinian Conception of *Karmakartṛ*" *Proceedings of the International Seminar on Studies in the Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Edited by S. D. Joshi and S. D. Laddu. University of Poona. Pune, 1983, p. 11–16.

11. J. A. F. Roodbergen, "Time for a little something". *Pāṇinian Studies. Prof. S. D. Joshi Felicitation Volume*. Edited by M. M. Deshpande and S. Bhate. Centre for South and South–east Asian Studies. University of Michigan. Number 37. 1991, p. 293–321.

12. H. Scharfe, Pāṇini's Metalanguage. *Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 89. Philadelphia, 1971.

□ □ □

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

INTRODUCTION

Survey of the subjects dealt with in *Adhyāya* 1, *pāda* 3.

1. As regards its contents, *pāda* 3 of the first *adhyāya* easily falls into four main sections, as follows :

A. P.1.3.1 – 11, definitions and two conventions

B. P.1.3.12 – 16, general rules concerning *ātm.* endings including two exceptions

C. P.1.3.17 – 77, the addition of *ātm.* endings in the sense of *kartṛ* 'agent'

D. P.1 3.78 – 93, the addition of *par.* endings in the sense of *kartṛ* by way of the *śeṣa* 'the rest' – device

Out of the total of 93 rules, 90 can be safely considered to belong to the Pāṇinian core of the A. The doubtful rules are P. 1.3.10,11 and 93. As regards P. 1.3.10 and 11, one may wonder why they have been put here. In addition, P. 1.3.10 states a *laukika* 'non–technical' principle which is not restricted to grammar, whereas P. 1.3.11 states a redundant principle for the ascertainment of an *adhikāra* 'section heading'. To distinguish *adhikāras* in the A. other means are available, like incompatibility, re–enforcement by *ca* and *sāmarthya*. We note that Kātyāyana does not clearly terminologically distinguish between *adhikāra* and *anuvṛtti*, see Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 31. Another doubtful case is P. 1.3.93 which comes at the end of the *pāda* and which deals with the periphrastic future. See the present volume, p. 166.

2. The break–up of the main sections in more detail is as follows :

A. P. 1.3.1 defines the term *dhātu* 'verbal base'. P. 1.3.2–9 define what is meant by *it* in Pāṇini's *upadeśa* 'technical usage'. P. 1.3.10 lays down the *yathāsaṃkhyam* convention. P. 1.3.11 states that an *adhikāra* 'section heading' has been marked with the *svarita* accent.

B. P. 1.3.12–14 are general rules dealing with *ātm.* endings. They respectively state that verbal bases marked with *anudātta* or with the *anubandha* 'tag–letter' *Ṅ* in the *Dhātupāṭha* take *ātm.* endings in the sense of *kartṛ*; that for all verbal bases the grammatical meaning conveyed by the *ātm.* endings is that of *bhāva* 'impersonal action' or *karman* 'direct object', that is, the passive sense; and that the *ātm.* endings may also convey the sense of *kartṛ*, when the question is of *karmavyatihāra* 'reciprocity of action'.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

P. 1.3.15–16 continue the subject of *karmavyatihāra* and state two exceptions to P. 1.3.14.

C. P. 1.3.17–77 deal mostly with particular verbs after which the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* on a variety of conditions. Three general rules here, not specifying a verbal base or verbal bases, are P. 1.3.62, 72 and 74. The first rule says that a desiderative base takes *ātm.* endings, if the original base does so. The second rule says that verbal bases marked with *svarita* or with *Ñ* in the *Dhātupāṭha* take *ātm.* endings, if the result of the action is meant to benefit the agent. The third rule says that a causative base takes the *ātm.* endings, if the result of the causative action is meant to benefit the (causing) agent.

D. P. 1.3.78–93 deal with particular verbal bases after which the *par.* endings are added as exceptions to the rules stated in section B, again on a variety of conditions.

3. In section C groupings of rules have been made with the help of different criteria :

(1) On the basis of the verbal base dealt with

kṛÑ– P. 1.3.32 – 35
kram– P. 1.3.38 – 43
gṝ – P. 1.3.51 – 52
car – P. 1.3.53 – 54
jñā – P. 1.3.44 – 46
nī – P. 1.3.36 – 37
bhuj – P. 1.3.66 – 67
vad – P. 1.3.48 – 50
sthā – P. 1.3.22 – 26
hvā – P. 1.3.30 – 31

(2) On the basis of intransitive usage : P. 1.3.26–28
(3) On the basis of syntactic construction : P. 1.3.54–55
(4) On the basis of being a desiderative base : P. 1.3.57–59
(5) On the basis of being a causative base : P. 1.3.67–71
(6) On the basis of taking a *śit–vikaraṇa* : P. 1.3.60–61 (a)
(7) On the basis of the result of the action being meant to benefit the agent : P. 1.3.72–77

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

4. In section D groupings of rules have been made with the help of the following criteria :

(1) On the basis of the verbal base dealt with *ram-* : P. 1.3.83-85

(2) On the basis of being a causative base : P. 1.3.86-89

(3) On the basis of tense markers : P. 1.3.91-93

Thus, from a comparison of the criteria applied in the sections C and D it appears that in section D only one new criterion for grouping has been used, namely, that of tense markers. This brings the total of the grouping-criteria applied in the third *pāda* to 8.

5. It may be interesting to have a look at the conditions, lexical, grammatical and otherwise, stated in the rules belonging to the sections C and D. How did Pāṇini specify these conditions, which categories did he use to ensure the correct addition of *ātm.* endings and of *par.* endings as exceptions to the rules mentioned in section C ? We note the following categories :

(1) The verbal base must be marked with *anudātta* or with Ṅ in the *Dhātupāṭha*, P. 1.3.12.

(2) The verbal base must be marked with *svarita* or with $\tilde{N}$ in the *Dhātupāṭha*, in combination with another condition. P. 1.3.72.

(3) The verbal base must co-occur with a particular *upasarga* or with particular *upasargas*. This is the category most commonly used. In P. 1.3.43 the absence of an *upasarga* has been mentioned as a condition.

(4) The verbal base must convey a particular lexical meaning, or particular lexical meanings. E. g. P. 1.3.32, 38, 39. This is the second most common category, often in combination with (3).

(5) The verbal base must be used transitively, or, more often, intransitively. E. g. P. 1.3.53, 26-29, 85.

(6) The action must be meant to benefit the agent. E. g. P. 1.3.72-76.

(7) A particular syntactic construction is required. P. 1.3.34, 37, 54-55, 67.

(8) The verbal base must co-occur with a particular word (different from an *upasarga*). P. 1.3.71.

(9) The verbal base *kṛ* must be used as an auxiliary (*anuprayoga*) in the periphrastic perfect. P. 1.3.63.

(10) The base must be a denominative base. P. 1.3.90.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

(11) The base must be a causative base. E. g. P. 1.3.67–71, 74, 85–87. In P. 1.3.88 non–*ṆiC* is mentioned as a condition.

(12) The base must be a desiderative base. E. g. P.1.3.57–59, 67–71, 92.

(13) The verbal base must be provided with particular tense or mood markers. E. g. P. 1.3.61, 91–93.

(14) The agent must have a thinking mind (*cittavatkartṛka*). P. 1.3.88.

Often catagories are used in combination.

6. As topics of general theoretical interest we mention, in alphabetical order, the following :

A. Devanāgarī alphabet

(1) *adhikāra*. Note 5 on P. 1.3.11.

(2) *anubandhas*. The status of ... Note 4 on P. 1.3.9.

(3) *ātman*. The word *ātman* as the direct object of a causative verb. Note 7 on P. 1.3.67.

(4) *utsarga – apavāda*. Note 7 on P. 1.3.12.

(5) *upadeśa*. Notes 5 and 7 on P. 1.3.2.

(6) *upasarga*. The definition of the term. Note 4 on P. 1.3.78.

The sequence of *upasarga* + *aṬ* + verbal base. Note 6 on P. 1.3.60.

(7) *–os* as a du. abl. ending. Note 3 on P. 1.3.10.

(8) *karman*. Different meanings of *karman* in the A. Note 13 on P. 1.3.67.

Different types of *karman*. Note 11 on P. 1.3.67.

(9) *karmasthabhāvaka* and *karmasthakriyaka*. Notes 7 and 11 on P. 1.3.67.

(10) *kriyāvacana* and *bhāvavacana*. Notes 8 and 11 on P. 1.3.1.

(11) *ca*. Note 1 on P. 1.3.21 (a); Note (3) on P. 1.3.21 (b); Note 2 on P. 1.3.23; Note 2 on P. 1.3.26.

(12) *dyotakatva* or *vācakatva* of the *ātm*. endings, Note 4 on P. 1.3.23.

(13) *paratva* as a conflict–solving principle. Note 7 on P. 1.3.12.

(14) *paryudāsa* or *prasajyapratiṣedha*. Note 9 on P. 1.3.20.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

(15) *pratyayaniyama* or *prakṛtyarthaniyama* or *prakṛtiniyama*. Note 8 on P. 1.3.12; Note 1 on P. 1.3.13; Note 6 on P. 1.3.78.

(16) *pratyāhāra*. The *pratyāhāra haL*. Note 3 on P. 1.3.3.

(17) *phala* and *vyāpāra*. Note 11 on P. 1.3.67.

(18) *bhāva*. Meanings of the term. Note 8 on P. 1.3.13; Note 7 on P. 1.3.27.

(19) *lopa*. Note 3 on P. 1.3.9.

(20) *vikaraṇa*. Note 7 on P. 1.3.12; Note 6 on P. 1.3.60.

(21) *śeṣa*. The *śeṣa*–device. Note 4 on P. 1.3.78.

(22) *saṃsarga* and *viprayoga*. Note 2 on P. 1.3.66.

(23) *samartha* Note 5 on P. 1.3.42.

(24) *siddhatva* as a conflict–solving principle. Note 7 on P. 1.3.12.

B. Roman alphabet :

(1) Action. The analysis of an action. Note 8 on P. 1.3.46.

(2) Causative and reflexive constructions. Note 7 on P. 1.3.67.

(3) Conflict of rules. Note 6 on P. 1.3.60.

(4) Ergatives. Note 10 on P. 1.3.67.

(5) Lexical and grammatical meaning. Note 3 on P. 1.3.14.

(6) Meaning–conditions : part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* ? Note 3 on P. 1.3.14.

(7) Periphrastic future. Note 6 on P. 1.3.93.

(8) Reflexive constructions. Note 9 on P. 1.3.67.

(9) Reflexive causative constructions according to Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita Note 12 on P. 1.3.67.

(10) Reflexive causative constructions according to Bhartṛhari. Note 12 on P. 1.3.67.

(11) The transformational approach to grammar in Sanskrit linguistics. Note 9 on P. 1.3.67.

(12) Transitive and intransitive. Note 4 on P. 1.3.26.

□ □ □

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

AṢṬĀDHYĀYĪ

1. Adhyāya 1

1.3. Pāda 3

1.3.1 BHŪVĀDAYO DHĀTAVAḤ '*bhū–*, etc. (are called) *dhātu* "verbal base"'

1. This is a *saṃjñāsūtra*. The *saṃjñin* 'item thus named' is mentioned first.

2. The *uddeśya* is *bhūvādayaḥ*. The *vidheya* is *dhātavaḥ*. By the introduction of a new *uddeśya* and a new *vidheya* any previous subject and predicate items are automatically discontinued. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4. In fact, there is no connection with the previous rules whatsoever. Whether the division of the sūtras into *pādas* and *adhyāyas* was intended by Pāṇini is not known.

3. The straightforward translation of the rule stated above clearly assumes that Pāṇini's intention was to define what is called *dhātu* by way of enumeration (*parigaṇana*). The bases *bhū–*, etc. have been listed in the *dhātupāṭha* (*Dhp.*) as divided up into ten classes, traditionally called the *daśagaṇī*. The ten *gaṇas* have been subdivided into *antargaṇas* 'subgroups' according to criteria of voice : whether the *dhātus* concerned take *parasmaipada* endings or *ātmanepada* endings or both. See Palsule 1961, p. 27–36. According to the Böhtlingk edition of the *Dhp.*, the total number of verbal bases is 1959 or 1960, depending on the number of the class IV bases.

It is generally accepted that the original *Dhp.* as known to Kātyāyana and Patañjali did not contain meaning–explanations of the bases listed. Thus the beginning of the *Dhp.* would be read as *bhvedhaspardha*. Kaiyaṭa (on *Bh.* No. 20 on the present rule) expressly says that the meaning–explanations are *apāṇinīya* 'non–pāṇinian'. See Palsule, p. 91; Cardona, p. 161–2.

4. P. 1.2.45–46 have defined the notion *prātipadika*. The following rules of the second *pāda* continue to deal with *prātipadika*s somehow. Then, at the beginning of the third *pāda*, the term *dhātu* is introduced. Why this

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

term is introduced after rules dealing with the notion of *prātipadika* is not clear. The point is that in the A. *dhātu* is a more basic concept than *prātipadika* and therefore, logically speaking, should have been introduced first.

5. The term *dhātu* means 'basic element'. According to the *KV* on the present rule, *dhātu* as a linguistic term was first used by prepāṇinian teachers, apparently as a synonym of *prakṛti*. A pāṇinian *dhātu* is a basic element in the sense that it serves as the starting-point of word derivation. In the *A*. the suffixation rules (*kṛt*, *tiṄ suP* and *taddhita*) are introduced after P. 3.1.91, *dhātoḥ*. For the ancient controversy regarding the general derivability of words by means of a stem-suffix analysis see *TA*, fn. 468.

6. Later on, by P. 3.1.32, the scope of the designation *dhātu* is widened to include derived verbal bases like desideratives also.

7. Patañjali (*Mbh*. I. p. 253, line 4) mentions a *ślokavārttika* which says that the *v* in *bhūvādayaḥ* is for the sake of good luck (*maṅgala*). Kaiyaṭa (on *Bh*. No. 2 on the present rule) notes that the *v* is an augment and that the form *bhūvādayaḥ* being a *nipātana* 'readymade form' is known to the body of grammarians. As regards the connection of the *v* with good luck, Kaiyaṭa offers two explanations. The first one he takes from the *Nyāsa* (on the *KV* on the present rule): in daily life getting a new thing may be taken as a sign of good luck. But we may also hold that the sequence *bhūv* in *bhūvādayaḥ* reminds us of the *mahāvyāhṛtis* 'great utterances' (*bhūr bhuvaḥ svaḥ*), and that can only indicate good luck.

Really speaking, the *v* may have been inserted to retain the verbal base form intact, so that no doubt should be raised regarding the quantity of the *ū*-vowel of *bhū-*. Moreover, the variation *bhū/bhūv* is known from the pf. and aor. paradigms.

8. If what is called *dhātu* is defined merely by enumeration, how to distinguish between a verbal base and a homonymic form? One example offered by Patañjali (*Mbh*. p. 253, lines 14–15) is the verbal base *yā-* 'to go' and the fem. relative pronoun *yā*. There is another difficulty too. Since the *dhātus* are recited in continuous recitation, like *bhvedhaspardha*, etc., how to isolate the individual bases? These are the questions dealt with by Kātyāyana in *Vts* II and III.

When discussing the first difficulty Patañjali (*Mbh*. I, p. 254, line 13) introduces a definition of the notion *dhātu*. The definition says *kriyāvacano dhātuḥ* 'a *dhātu* expresses a *kriyā*'. The term *kriyā* is explained as *īhā* 'effort', *īhā* is explained as *ceṣṭā* 'movement', and *ceṣṭā* is explained as

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

vyāpāra 'activity'. It is rather immediately pointed out that this definition will exclude the verbal bases *as–*, *bhū–* and *vid–*, which all of them mean 'to be' (*Vt.* V). Patañjali tries to meet this difficulty later on (*Mbh.* I, p. 256, line 18) by mentioning another definition of the notion *dhātu*, namely, *bhāvavacano dhātuḥ* 'a *dhātu* expresses *bhāva* "being (there)". ' But this definition also runs into a number of difficulties.

In his *bhāṣya* on *Vt.* II Patañjali takes up the earlier definition, *kriyāvacano dhātuḥ*, again. This time he provides a defining characteristic of *kriyā*. He says, *kārakāṇāṃ pravṛttiviśeṣaḥ kriyā* 'a *kriyā* is a particular way of *kārakas* becoming operative'. By *kāraka* we will understand a factor which becomes instrumental in bringing about an action. See *KARA*, Introduction. p. i–iii; *VIBHA*, fn. 7. When *kriyā* is taken in this sense, the designation *dhātu* can be applied to *as-*, *bhū–* and *vid–* also (*Mbh.* I, p. 258, lines 11–12). The idea is that in the case of *as–* 'to exist' *kārakas* become operative in a different manner from, let us say, in the case of *mṛ–* 'to die' (*Mbh.* I, p. 258, lines 12–13).

In this connection reference is made to the six modes of being (*ṣaḍ bhāvavikārāḥ*) of Vārṣyāyaṇi (recorded by Yāska, *Nirukta* 1.1). Kaiyaṭa (on *Bh.* No. 72 on the present rule) explains that *bhāva* (in *bhāvavikāra*) may be interpreted in the sense of *kriyā* 'action', and that, since *as–* (*asti* 'he exists') has been included among the *bhāvavikāras*, *as–* may claim to be a *kriyā*. Nāgeśa (ibid.) adds that the six *vikāras* of Vārṣyāyaṇi are nothing but the six modes of action (*kriyāprakāra*) of *brahman*. Or, anyway, they appear like that under the influence of *māyā*.

Then Patañjali raises the question whether the defining characteristics of *dhātu*, namely, *kriyāvacana* and *bhāvavacana*, can be had from Pāṇini's *sūtra* as it is, or whether, to have them; we should expand the *sūtra* (*Mbh.* I, p. 258, lines 22–23). According to Patañjali, they can be read into the *sūtra* without requiring any change of the text. To this end, Patañjali first examines the meaning of the word *ādi*. He says that *ādi* is known to convey two meanings, *vyavasthā* 'fixed arrangement (as in a list) and *prakāra* 'type'. The example for the latter meaning is *devadattādaya āḍhya abhirūpā darśanīyāḥ pakṣavantaḥ* 'those beginning with Devadatta are rich, handsome, good-looking (and) possessing side-locks'. Here, from 'those beginning with Devadatta' we understand : persons of the type of Devadatta, persons like Devadatta. Moreover, Patañjali says that the word *ādi* is to be connected with each member of the compound to which it has been added (*pratyekaṃ cādiśabdaḥ parisamāpyate*) (*Mbh.* I, p. 258, lines 24–27).

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The cp. under discussion is *bhūvādayaḥ*. As Patañjali interprets it, *bhūvā* is a *dvandva* cp. stem. It can be analysed as *bhūś ca vāś ca, bhūvau*. Here *bhū-* refers to the verbal base *bhū-* whereas *vā-* is a also taken to refer to a verbal base, namely, the one noted down as *vā gatigandhanayoḥ* 'vā- in the sense of going or deriding' (*Dhp*. 2.41). *Bhū-* is a *bhāvavacana dhātu* and *vā-* is a *kriyāvacana dhātu*. To this *dvandva* cp. stem the dual form *ādī* (*ādiś ca ādiś ca, ādī*) is added, so as to form the *bahuvrīhi* cp. stem *bhūvādi*. Now Patañjali's idea is that to have the sense of *kriyāvacana* from *bhūvādayaḥ* analysed as *bhū- ādayaḥ* + *vā- ādayaḥ* we will take *ādi* in connection with *bhū-* in the sense of *vyavasthā*, and *ādi* in connection with *vā-* in the sense of *prakāra*. Thus *bhūvādayaḥ* is taken to mean '*bhū-*, etc. (in the arrangement of the *Dhp*.) and *vā*-type forms'. As noted by the *Nyāsa* (on the *KV* on the present rule), hereby the designation *dhātu* is barred from applying to homonymic forms, because these are not *kriyāvacana*. In order to have the sense of *bhāvavacana* from *bhūvādayaḥ* in the the same analysis we will take *ādi* in connection with *bhū-* in the sense of *prakāra*, and *ādi* in connection with *vā-* in the sense of *vyavasthā*. Thus *bhūvādayaḥ* is taken to mean '*bhū-* type forms and *vā-*, etc. (in the arrangement of the *Dhp*.)' (*Mbh*. I, p. 258, line 27 – p. 259, line 3). As explained by Kaiyaṭa (on *Bh*. No. 78 on the present rule), in the latter case it becomes imperative to remind ourselves that the verbal base *vā-* in the analysis proposed occurs at the very beginning of the *Dhp*.

As to how exactly the meaning *kriyāvacana* is obtained from the analysis '*bhū-*, etc. and forms similar to *vā*', and the meaning *bhāvavacana* from the analysis 'forms similar to *bhū-* and *vā-*, etc', is not clear. Apparently, in the combinations indicated by 'and' the portion 'similar to' is the dominating portion, or so Patañjali thinks.

9. The *KV* offers a straightforward interpretation of P. 1.3.1, but adds the word *kriyāvanana* in order to debar the designation *dhātu* from becoming applicable to homonymic forms like *yā* (fem. relative pronoun) or *vā* (particle) or *div* (noun stem). But there may be another reason also why the mention of *kriyāvacana* is deemed desirable, as will be explained below.

10. A question which remained so far was how to identify the several verbal bases in the continuous recitation of the *Dhp*. In *Vt*. III Kātyāyana has stated that a *parimāṇa* 'measure' has to be mentioned by which we can identify the single verbal bases. But what kind of measure, and how to apply it ?

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The difficulty raised is solved also by the mention of *kriyāvacana* in the definition of *dhātu*. A sequence like *bhvedhaspardha* as a whole cannot be *kriyāvacana*, but forms taken in isolation like *bhū–*, *edha–*, *spardha–* are *kriyāvacana*. Thus the definition *kriyāvacano dhātuḥ* provides a criterion by which the continuous recitation of the *Dhp.* can be divided up into single isolated verbal bases.

This, however, leads to a further question : how to establish the *dhātu* in forms like *pacati* ' he cooks ', *paṭhati* ' he recites ' etc. ? Meaning is conveyed by such forms as a whole (*Vt.* IV). Then how to distinguish between preverb, base and suffix ? Here *Vt.* VI provides the answer. It says that we can manage with the help of *anvaya* and *vyatireka*, agreement and contrast. Already earlier, in *Vt.* IX on P. 1.2.45, reference had been made to this principle which provides the procedure for the identification and isolation of morphemes in a finished form (*pada*). The linguistic pair contrasted in the present context is *pacati–paṭhati* (*Mbh.* I. p. 255, lines 13–16). The forms show both dissimilar and common phonetic elements. From these forms we also understand dissimilar (lexical) and common (grammatical) meanings. Now the *anvayavyatireka* principle tells us to connect the common meaning with the common phonetic element and the dissimilar meaning with the dissimilar phonetic element. See S. D. Joshi 1967, p. 5–6. That gives us *pac* versus *paṭh* on the one hand, and the common element *ati* (third person, singular) on the other. The conclusion is that the sequences *pac* and *paṭh* are responsible for the difference regarding *kriyā* ' action '. Therefore we will apply the designation *dhātu* to precisely these sequences (*Mbh.* I, p. 255, lines 16–20).

11. In the A. the word *kriyāvacana* is not used, whereas the word *bhāvavacana* has been used just once (in P. 3.3.11) in the sense of an action noun.

But, apart from terminology, does Pāṇini provide clues for the factual distinction between *kriyāvacana* and *bhāvavacana* verbs ? One case in point is P. 3.3.10. This rule prescribes the suffix *tumUN* in the sense of *kriyā* ' action ' performed for another action. An example is *bhoktuṃ vrajati* ' he goes in order to eat '. But usages like *bhavituṃ vrajati* ' he goes in order to be ' or *gantuṃ bhavati* ' he is in order to go ', in which *bhū–* is a *bhāvavacana* verb, are not attested. Therefore we may take it that Paṇini's expression *kriyāyāṃ kriyārthāyām* ' in the sense of action (performed) for the sake of another action ' factually excludes the addition of *tumUN* in the case of a verbal base which is not *kriyāvacana* but *bhāvavacana*. Compare Dinabandhu Kar, *Semantic Basis of the Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Unpublished thesis. University of Poona, 1980, p. 157.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

P. 3.4.65 prescribes the suffix *tumUN* after any verbal base in construction with *śak-* 'to be able', etc. and with verbal bases having the meaning of *as-* 'to be'. Here *asartha* verbs are clearly acknowledged as a separate category.

The distinction between *bhāva* and *kriyā* also plays a role in noun-formation. Suffixes may be specifically prescribed in the sense of *bhāva*. In that case they form action nouns. For instance, *KtiN* (P. 3.3.95), *Kta* (P. 3.3.114). The *taddhita*-section is admittedly a later section of the A. whose pāṇinian authorship is doubtful. But here also the difference between *bhāva* and *karman* (*kriyā*) is acknowledged. P. 5.1.119 prescribes the suffixes *tva* and *tā* in the sense of *bhāva*. P. 5.1.125 prescribes the suffix *ṢyaÑ* in the sense of *karman* 'activity'. For a further distinction between action as conveyed by a verbal base (*sādhya*) and action conveyed by a noun-suffix (*siddha*) see *TA*, Note (152).

12. Even if *kriyāvacana* and *bhāvavacana* are accepted as defining characteristics of *dhātu*, this does not mean that listing what is called *dhātu* becomes superfluous. Listing as *dhātu* remains necessary because certain linguistic forms might still be said to be *kriyāvacana* or *bhāvavacana* although they are not verbal bases.

When the question is of defining notions belonging to the philosophy of grammar or of notions involving philosophy in general, like *jāti*, *dravya*, *guṇa*, Pāṇini is singularly silent. He borrows a considerable number of terms from other sciences without entering into a discussion about their precise meanings, thus leaving us to formulate the concepts behind these terms. Wordclass categories are usually defined by enumeration, like in the case of *avyaya* and *sarvanāman*. Other grammatical categories may be defined on purely formal grounds, as in the case of *suP* and *tiṄ*, or again by enumeration. But grammatical notions required for Pāṇini's *upadeśa* are always defined, some way or other.

1.3.2 UPADEŚE 'JANUNĀSIKA IT' in (Pāṇini's) technical usage a nasal vowel (is called) *it*'

1. This is a *saṃjñāsūtra*. The *saṃjñin* is *upadeśe 'janunāsikaḥ* and has been mentioned first.

2. The *uddeśya* is *upadeśe 'janunāsikaḥ*. The *vidheya* is *it*. By the introduction of a new *uddeśya* and a new *vidheya* any previous subject and predicate items are automatically discontinued. See Joshi- Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

3. The present rule is the opening rule of a section which deals with tag–letters as part of Pāṇini's *upadeśa*. The letters are called *it* by Pāṇini and also *anubandha* by grammarians of Pāṇini's school from Kātyāyana (*Vt.* III on P. 1.3.3) onwards. The section ends with P. 1.3.9. One may wonder why these rules have been put here, immediately after the introduction of the designation *dhātu*. The reason may be that most of the pāṇinian *dhātus* have been provided with *it*–letters for different grammatical–technical purposes. Therefore the section on *it* is directly relevant in connection with what is called *dhātu*.

4. The present rule tells us that *it*–letters which represent vowels should have a nasal pronuncitation. This nasal pronunciation has been lost in the present day recitation of the *A*. As the *KV* on the present rule puts it, *pratijñānunāsikyāḥ pāṇinīyāḥ* ' the pāṇinīyas apply nasality by convention '. Just as the *ācāryas* apply pitch distinctions from memory, so also they apply nasality (*Nyāsa* on the *KV* on the present rule).

5. The *KV* does not gloss the rule as a whole. The word *upadeśa* is explained as *upadiśyate 'nena* ' it is taught by that ', a *GHaÑ*–derivation by P. 3.3.19 in the sense of *karaṇa* ' means '. Thus *upadeśa* is taken to mean ' the means of instruction '. This is further explained by the *KV* as *śāstravākyāni* ' the statements of grammar ', that is, the *sūtrapāṭha* and the *khilapāṭha* by which the *KV* means the *dhātupāṭha*. The *gaṇapāṭha* has not been mentioned explicitly.

By *upadeśa* the technical language of grammar is meant, as distinct from ordinary language. Characteristic of this technical language is that meaning is not taken into account, but the phonetic form only. Put negatively, we may say that anything derived in the *A*. is not *upadeśa*. A related term is *uddeśa*. See further *AP* I 1991, p. 30–31, 135.

6. The word *it* is derived from the verbal base *i* ' to go ', as follows :

i–	*Dhātup.* 2.36
i + KviP	P. 3.2.178
i + vi + tUK	P. 6.1.71
i + v° + t	P. 1.3.2; 1.3.9
i + 0 + t	P. 6.1.67
it.	

KviP is a *kṛt*–suffix. It therefore conveys the sense of *kartṛ*, by P. 3.4.67. Accordingly, *it* means ' it goes ' (*eti iti it*). The deletion rule involved is P. 1.3.9.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

7. Kātyāyana, in *Vt.* I on the present rule, says that the designation *it* has a chance to be applied to all (nasal vowels), because the rule (as known to Kātyāyana) lacks specification. The (vedic) example provided by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 259, line 16) is *abhrá ā̃ apáḥ* ' in the cloud the water... ' (ṚgV. 5.48.1). Then, in *Vt.* II, Kātyāyana says that we can manage by reading *upadeśane* in the rule. As explained by Patañjali, *upadeśana* means *śāstra* ' grammar '. Thus only those vowels which are pronounced as nasals in grammar are eligible for receiving the designation *it*.

Since Kātyāyana does not refer to the word *upadeśe* at all, it may be assumed that in his days P. 1.3.2 did not contain the word *upadeśe*. Moreover, the *pb. aupadeśikaprayogikayor aupadeśikasyaiva grahaṇam* (*PN, pb.* 120.2) is not taken into account. This *pb.* says that when a term is used in grammar which may be interpreted both in a technical and in a non-technical sense, preference should be given to the technical sense. On the other hand, the rule containing the word *upadeśe* is known to Patañjali. Little wonder that he rejects Kātyāyana's proposal. Presumably, in the time between Kātyāyana and Patañjali the word *upadeśe* has been inserted in the rule on the basis of Kātyāyana's idea of adding *upadeśane*.

1.3.3 HAL ANTYAM ' (in Pāṇini's technical usage) the final consonant (is called *it*) '.

1. This is a *saṃjñāsūtra*. The *saṃjñin* is *hal antyam*.

2. The *uddeśya* is *hal antyam*. The *vidheya* is *it*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* the previous subject item is blocked. See Joshi-Bhate, 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

Since the qualifier *anunāsikaḥ* from P. 1.3.2 is not blocked by a different qualifier in P. 1.3.3, theoretically it should be continued in P. 1.3.3. However, if Pāṇini had wanted to continue nasality as a qualifying notion in P. 1.3.3, he could have phrased the rule as *ñam antyam* ' a final nasal consonant (is called *it*) ', with the help of the *pratyāhāra ñaM*. Since he did not do so, but phrased his rule more widely by using the term *hal*-any consonant-, we conclude that the qualifier *anunāsikaḥ* is discontinued in P. 1.3.3 on the basis of *sāmarthya* ' the force (of the formulation of the rule itself) '.

3. In *Vt.* I on the present rule Kātyāyana draws attention to the fact that the rule does not contain any specification. Compare P. 1.3.2, sub 7. The consequence would be that any final consonant may be termed *it* and be deleted, by P. 1.3.9. In *Vt.* II Kātyāyana says that we can manage by reading the rule

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

as *vyavasitāntyaṃ hal* 'the final consonant of separated (forms is called *it*).' Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 261, line 10) explains that by *vyavasita* are meant *dhātus* 'verbal bases', *prātipādikas* 'noun stems', *pratyayas* 'suffixes', *nipātas* 'particles', *āgamas* 'augments' and *ādeśas* 'substitutes', which all of them belong to *upadeśa*. Kātyāyana's proposal is another indication that originally in P. 1.3.2 the word *upadeśe* was lacking.

Patañjali rejects Kātyāyana's proposal. He thinks that the word *antyam* in the rule is redundant, because relatively speaking every consonant is *antya* 'last' with regard to some other consonant. Then the question is, how to make this word *antya* purposeful? This Patañjali does by having recourse to a device called *prakarṣagati* 'the understanding of a higher degree'. Thereby *antya* is taken to mean *vyavasitāntya* 'a well-defined final', as explained above.

4. A more serious shortcoming in the phrasing of the rule is noted by Kātyāyana in *Vt.* III. Here he says that we cannot understand what is meant by *hal* because the *l* is not yet known as an *anubandha*. The problem is, how to establish the *pratyāhāra* 'abbreviative designation' *haL* in the present rule? On the one hand, the formation of this *pratyāhāra* is prescribed by P. 1.1.71. On the other hand, P. 1.1.71 requires the knowledge of the term *it* defined as *hal antyam* by P. 1.3.3. A clear case, so it seems, of the fallacy called *itaretarāśraya* 'circular reasoning'. As Patañjali has it, *itaretarāśrayāṇi ca kāryāṇi na prakalpante* 'and operations based on circular reasoning do not work' (*Mbh.* I, p. 40, line 20). In order to get rid of this fallacy we must show that the sūtra *hal antyam* can be interpreted without the help of P. 1.1.71.

Kātyāyana offers two solutions. First, in *Vt.* IV, he proposes : o interpret P. 1.3.3 as *hal antyaṃ lakāraś ca* '(in the *upadeśa*) a final consonant and (a final) *l* (are called *it*)', As explained by Kaiyaṭa (on *Bh.* No. 8 on the present rule), this interpretation is based on the assumption of *hal* as a *dvandva* cp. The cp. is analysed as *hal ca laś ca, hall.* Here the last *l* is deleted by P. 8.2.23. The two cp. constituents refer to the *pratyāhāra haL* and any *l* respectively. Now the point is that, apart from the *pratyāhāra haL*, there is also a *śivasūtra haL*. From P. 1.3.3 as interpreted above we know that the *l* of the *śivasūtra haL* is called *it*. Once this is known we may connect this *l* with any beginning sound by means of P. 1.1.71 to form a *pratyāhāra*. This is how we can establish the *pratyāhāra haL* mentioned in P. 1.3.3 without falling into the error of *itaretarāśraya*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Then, in *Vt.* V, Kātyāyana suggests that we can manage by assuming *ekaśeṣa* 'the retaining of a single form'. As explained by Patañjali, the technical startingpoint is *hal ca hal ca, hal* '(from) *hal* and *hal* (we derive) *hal*' (*Mbh.* I, p. 261, line 23). The *ekaśeṣa* rule applied here is P. 1.2.64. One of these two words *hal* is the *śivasūtra hal.*

It is this *śivasūtra hal* which is analysed by the *KV* on the present rule as *hasya l* 'the *l* of *ha*'. The *Nyāsa* here explains that the relation conveyed by this genitive *tp.* is *sāmīpya* 'nearness'. Apparently, reference is to P. 6.2.23. Thus *hal* is taken to mean 'the *l* which is near to *ha*'. That particular *l* is called *it.* Once this is known we may connect this *l* with any beginning sound by P. 1.1.71, to form a *pratyāhāra.* This is how we can establish the *pratyāhāra hal* mentioned in P. 1.3.3 without falling into the error of *itaretarāśraya.*

However, the *KV* differs from Kātyāyana (*Vt.* V) in that it does not assume *ekaśeṣa,* but *tantra* 'multipurposiveness' (see *PASPA,* fn. 894). As explained by the *Nyāsa* here, *yad ekam āvṛttibhedam antareṇāpy anekeṣām upakāraṃ karoti tat tantram. Yathā pradīpaḥ suprajvalito bahūnāṃ chātrāṇām upakāraṃ karoti* 'that which alone even without a difference consisting in repetition is helpful for several (persons or things) is *tantra.* For instance, a well-burning lamp is helpful for many students'. The idea is that by means of one expression *hal* two purposes are served, namely, to have the designation *it* for the final *l* of the *śivasūtra hal,* and to have the *pratyāhāra hal.* The *Nyāsa* here, however, prefers not to invoke *tantra,* but to speak of a special effort.

To the solutions proposed by Kātyāyana Patañjali adds two more of his own (*Mbh.* I, p. 262, lines 1–3).

The *Śabdakaustubha* (Reprint from The *Chowkhambā Sanskrit Series,* Vol. II, Fasc. 5–10, Benares 1929, p. 56. line 14) mentions three interpretations of P. 1.3.3 as *tantrāvṛttyekaśeṣāṇām anyatamāśrayaṇa* 'having recourse to any out of *tantra,* repetition and *ekaśeṣa*'. The idea of justifying the word *hal* in P. 1,3.3 by means of *āvṛtti* consists in this that the *sūtra* is repeated. Thus we assume two sutras, *hal antyam, hal antyam.* The word *hal* in one of these two sūtras refers to the *śivasūtra hal.* The argument involved is the same as the one stated above.

1.3.4 NA VIBHAKTAU TUSMĀḤ 'a *tU* (–letter), *s* or *m* in a *vibhakti* (are) not (called *it*)'

1. The series of *saṃjñāsūtras* is interrupted by a prohibition. In three cases which are enumerated the final consonant is not called *it.* Consequently, these finals are not deleted.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

2. The prohibition applies to the *vidheya* stated in the immediately preceding rule. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 274, convention 42. Since P. 1.3.4 is a prohibition the question of *anuvṛtti* does not arise. P. 1.3.4 simply prohibits P. 1.3.3 in certain cases.

3. The change of *it* to *itaḥ* (plural) is not required, because in Pāṇini's technical usage the rules for gender and number which hold for ordinary language can be waived.

4. By P. 1.1.69 the *saṃjñā tU* stands for sounds homogeneous with *t*, that is, for consonants belonging to the *t*–class (*tavarga*). By *vibhakti* Pāṇini understands personal endings and case endings (P. 1.4.104) and some suffixal endings mentioned in a sub–section of the *taddhita*–section, namely, P.5.3.1–26.

5. Kātyāyana, in *Vt.* I on the present rule, phrases an exception to the prohibition stated by P. 1.3.4. *Vt.* I says that this prohibition does not apply when the *vibhakti* also happens to be called *taddhita*.

Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 262, lines 20–21) provides the example *kva* 'where'. The (slightly simplified; see *AP* II, on P. 1.2.31, sub 9) derivation is as follows :

(1)	(*kim* + *Ni*) + *aT*	P. 4.1.2; 5.3.12
(2)	(*kim* + °) + *a*	P. 2.4.71; *Vt.* I on P. 1.3.4
(3)	*kva* + *a*	P. 7.2.105
(4)	*kv*° + *a*	P. 6.4.148
	kva.	

Since the suffix *aT* has been prescribed by P. 5.3.12, it is called *vibhakti*. Therefore, by P. 1.3.4, the final *t* of *aT* would not be called *it*. Consequently, this *t* cannot be deleted, by P. 1.3.9. This is not desired. We want to delete it, and this is where Katyayana's *Vt.* helps out.

Patañjali rejects the *Vt.* He thinks that we can have what we want by means of a clue. The clue is provided by the word *thamuḥ* in P. 5.3.24. *Thamu* is a *taddhita* suffix prescribed after the pronominal stem *idam*, in order to derive the form *ittham*. The clue consists in this that, apparently, the *U* has been added to protect (*paritrāṇārtham*) the final *m* of *tham*. That is to say, the addition of *U* prevents the *m* from being called *it* and from being subsequently deleted (*Mbh.* I, p. 262, lines 22–23). This goes to show that it was Pāṇini's intention to prohibit the designation *it* from becoming applicable to certain finals of a *taddhita* suffix which also receives the designation *vibhakti*, or so Patañjali thinks.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

In a few cases the *itsaṃjñā*-rules (or their prohibition) do not apply to suffixes mentioned in the *taddhita*-section. Kātyāyana notices that and provides the adjustment required. But why didn't Pāṇini notice ? The question is of interest because the lack of provision on Pāṇini's part may be taken as another piece of evidence for assuming that the *taddhita*-section has been added to the A, only later on. See *Proceedings* 1983, p. 59–95.

6. Patañjali does not provide examples for P. 1.3.4 itself in his *bhāṣya*. The *KV* does. They are respectively *vṛkṣāt, plakṣāt* for a final *tavarga* consonant in a *vibhakti* (case ending); *pacathas* and *pacathas* for a final *s* in a *vibhakti* (personal ending); and *apacatām* and *apacatam* for a final *m* in a *vibhakti* (personal ending).

The *KV* makes no mention of Kātyāyana's *Vt.* or of Patañjali's *jñāpaka* 'clue', but merely notes that P. 1.3.4 is *anitya* 'not invariably applicable'. By way of exception reference is made precisely to P. 5.3.25.

Another instance in which P. 1.3.4 does not become applicable and another reason why it does not become applicable is provided by P. 3.4.106. This rule prescribes the substitution of *aT* for the first person singular *ātm.* ending of what is called *lIṄ*. Here the *T* of *aT* is called *it* and is subsequently deleted, as is desired. But, one may ask, why doesn't the prohibition stated by P. 1.3.4 apply ? The reason is that the status of *vibhakti* is assumed by *aT* only on account of *sthānivadbhāva*. The original ending, *i* is called *vibhakti* by P. 1.4.104. The substitute ending, *aT*, inherits this designation by *sthānivadbhāva* 'treatment (of the substitute) like the original'. But, prior to the replacement, *aT* is not a *vibhakti*. Since it is not originally a *vibhakti*, P. 1.3.4 does not become applicable. Therefore the *T* of *aT* is called *it*, and, consequently, it is deleted.

1.3.5 ĀDIR ÑIṬUḌAVAḤ '(in Pāṇini's technical usage the groups (*ñi*, *ṭu* and *ḍu* (occurring) as an initial (are called *it*)'

1. This is a *saṃjñāsūtra*. The *saṃjñin* is *ādir ñiṭuḍavaḥ*.

2. The *uddeśya* is *ādir ñiṭuḍavaḥ*. The *vidheya* is *it*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* any previous subject item is cancelled. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

3. The items *upadeśe* and *it* are continued from P. 1.3.2. For the grammatical number of *it* as required by the present rule see P. 1.3.4, sub. 3.

4. Patañjali has not commented on this rule. The *KV* says that the word *it* is continued, and that the word *ādi* is to be connected with *ñi*, *ṭu* and

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

ḍu separately. The prohibition *na* from P. 1.3.4 is discontinued on the basis of *sāmarthya*. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 274, convention 39.

5. The groups mentioned are prefixed to certain verbal bases. As a result, certain *kṛt*–suffixes are added to these bases. Thus *ñi* indicates that the suffix *Kta* is added in the sense of the present (P. 3.2.187; 3.2.123). *Ṭu* indicates that the suffix *athuC* may be added in the sense of action noun or a *kāraka* other than agent (P. 3.3.89). *Ḍu* indicates that the suffix *Ktri* may be added in the same sense as *athuC* (P. 3.3.88). The addition of *Ktri* invariably involves the addition of *maP*, by P. 4.4.20.

6. As counterexamples for the word *ādiḥ* in the rule the *KV* mentions *paṭūyati* ' treats someone as clever ' (P. 3.1.10) and *kaṇḍūyati* 'scratches because of itch '. The *Nyāsa* here notes that these verbs (apart from the non–initial groups *ṭu* and *ḍu*) also contain a long *ū*–vowel. Thus what we seem to have here is not *ṭu* and *ḍu*, but *ṭū* and *ḍū*. This being so, how can *paṭūyati* and *kaṇḍūyati* serve as counterexamples ? The answer given by the *Nyāsa* is that in the *upadeśa*-stage, that is, the stage prior to the application of rules of derivation, the two verbal bases mentioned have a short *u*. Its lengthening (by P. 7.4.25) is the outcome of the derivational process. However, in connection with the groups *ṭu* and *ḍu*, what counts is the *upadeśa*–stage only. Therefore the counterexamples are correct. Moreover, the *Nyāsa* says, the word *upadeśe* is continued in the present rule, and even if it were not, recourse can be had to *PN*, *pb.* 37.

1.3.6 ṢAḤ PRATYAYASYA ' (in Pāṇini's technical usage) a *ṣ* (which forms the beginning) of a suffix (is called *it*)'.

1. This is *a saṃjñāsūtra*. The *saṃjñin* is *ṣaḥ pratyayasya*.

2. The *uddeśya* is *ṣaḥ pratyayasya*. The *vidheya* is *it*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* any previous subject item is cancelled. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

3. The items *upadeśe*, *it* and *ādiḥ* are continued from P. 1.3.2 and 1.3.5

4. Patañjali has not commented on this rule. For the *anubandha Ṣ* the *KV* refers to P. 3.1.145. This rule prescribes the *kṛt*–suffix *ṢvuN* (replaced by *aka*, P. 7.1.1) in the sense of a person knowing a particular craft (*śilpin*). The function of the *anubandha Ṣ* is to ensure the addition of the fem. suffix *ṄīṢ* (P. 4.1.41). Thus, from *nṛt*– ' to dance ' we derive respectively *nartaka* (*guṇa* by P. 7.3.86) and the fem. *nartakī* ' a female dancer '. In the same way, from *rañj–/raj–* we derive respectively *rajaka* (loss of nasal by *Vt.* V on P. 6.2.24) and *rajakī* ' a washerwoman '.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.3.7 CUṬŪ '(in Pāṇini's technical usage) a *cU*-letter or a *ṭu*-letter (which forms the beginning of a suffix is called *it*)'

1. This is a *saṃjñāsūtra*. The *saṃjñin* is *cuṭū*.

2. The *uddeśya* is *cuṭū*. The *vidheya* is *it*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* any previous subject item is cancelled. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

3. The items *vpadeśe it*, *ādiḥ* and *pratyayasya* are continued from P. 1.3.2, 1.3 5 and 1.3.6.

4. The form *cuṭū* is a *dvandva* cp. By P. 1.1.69 the constituents *cu* and *ṭu* stand for sounds homogeneous with *c*, that is, for consonants belonging to the *c*–class (*cavarga*) and for sounds homogeneous with *ṭ*, that is for consonants belonging to the *ṭ*–class (*ṭavarga*).

5. Kātyāyana, in *Vt.* I on the present rule, mentions two suffixes, *cuñcUP* and *caṇAP*, for which a prohibition of the *itsaṃjñā* by P. 1.3.7 is to be phrased. The suffixes have been prescribed by the *taddhita*–rule P. 5.2.26 in the sense of *tena vittiḥ* 'famous because of that'. Thus we derive *vidyācuñcuḥ* 'famous because of learning' and *keśacaṇaḥ* 'famous because of (his) hair'. The idea is that the first *c* of these suffixes should not be called *it* and, consequently be deleted. In *Vt.* II Kātyāyana says that we can manage, because there is no point at all in thinking that the first *c* of the suffixes is meant to be an *anubandha*. If it were, the author of P. 5.2.26 could have easiiy avoided the difficulty by phrasing the rule as *tena vittir uñcubaṇapau*. Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 263, lines 14–15), however, explains that the *c* might still have a purpose as an *it*–letter in that it serves to make the accent–rule P. 6.1.163 applicable. This rule contains the term *cit* '(a suffix) having *C* as an *it*–letter' and prescribes that a stem formed with a *taddhita*–suffix which is *cit* is *antodātta*. But then it may be objected, why have *cuñcuP* and *caṇaP* been marked with *P*? The purpose of this *anubandha* has been defined by P. 3.1.4 : suffixes marked with *P* are *anudātta*. To solve this difficulty, *Vt.* III says that we may assume an alternative : the addition of *cuñcuP* and *caṇaP* gives rise either to *antodātta* or to *anudātta*. Patañjali is not satisfied and proposes a still more farfetched solution (*Mbh.* I p. 263, line 18).

In *Vt.* IV Kātyāyana says that the group *ir* (added at the end of verbal bases in the *Dhp.*) should be called *it*. Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 263, line 20) provides the example *rudhIR* (*Dhp.* 7.1). The purpose of applying the *itsaṃjñā* here is to have the optional *aṄ*–substitution for *cli* by P. 3.1.57. In the case of *rudh*–, this leaves us with an option between *arudhat* (the

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

aṄ–form) and *arautsīt*. But why not remove the anubandhas *I* and *R* piecemeal ? The *R* is called *it* by P. 1.3.3, the *I* by P. 1.3.2, and then P. 1.3.9 is applied successively. Here the difficulty is that, after the deletion of *R*, P. 7.1.58 becomes applicable in connection with *rudhI*. This rule prescribes that the augment *nUM* is to be infixed into the verbal base. This is not desired. Therefore the group *ir* has to be removed as a whole.

1.3.8 LAŚAKV ATADDHITE '(In Pāṇini's technical usage) a *l*, *ś* or a *kU*–letter (which form the beginning of a suffix are called *it*) but not in the case of a *taddhita* (–suffix)'

1. This is a *saṃjñāsūtra*. The *saṃjñin* is *laśakv ataddhite*.

2. The *uddeśya* is *laśakv ataddhite*. The *vidheya* is *it*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* any previons subject item is cancelled. See Joshi–Bhate, p. 271, convention 4.

3. The items *upadeśe it*, *ādiḥ* and *pratyayasya* are continued from P. 1.3.2, 1.3.5 and 1.3.6.

4. If the *itsaṃjñā*–section is assumed to be part of the original A, and if the *taddhita*–section is assumed to have been added to the A, later on, then the word *ataddhite* cannot have formed part of the original rule, but must have been added later on also.

5. The form *laśaku* is a *samāhāradvandva*. By P. 1.1.69 the constituent *ku* stands for sounds homogeneous with *k*, that is, for consonants belonging to the *k*–class (*kavarga*).

6. Patañjali has not commented on this rule. The *KV* quotes examples for each category of *it*–letters. For the *L* reference is to P. 3.3.115 (*LyuṬ*). For the *S* reference is to P. 3.1.68 (*ŚaP*). For the *K*, etc. reference is to P. 3.3.102 (*niṣṭhā*), P. 3.2.38 (*KHaC*), P. 3.2.139 (*Gsnu*), P. 3.2.161 (*GHuraC*) and to the ablative and genitive forms *vṛkṣāt* and *vṛkṣasya* (*ṄasI* and *Ṅas*).

The *Nyāsa* here notes that the reference to P. 3.2.139 may be objected to, because the suffix mentioned by the rule is usually read as *KsnU*. But, as stated by the *KV* on P. 3.2.139, the suffix is *Git* ' having *G* as an *it*–letter', not *Kit* ' having *K* as an *it*–letter '.

1.3.9 TASYA LOPAḤ ' of that (which is called) *it* deletion (takes place)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*, that is, a rule prescribing a grammaticai operation. The grammatical operation concerns elements of Pāṇini's meta–language.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

2. The word *tasya* obviously refers to what was called *it* by the previous rules. Therefore, to have the proper grammatical construction we assume *vibhaktivipariṇāma* 'change of case ending', and instead of *it*, we supply *itaḥ* 'of (that) *it*'.

The term *lopa* had been defined by P. 1.1.60 as *adarśanam* 'non-appearance'. Accordingly, that which is called *it* does not appear as part of the actual language form.

3. Before taking up Kātyāyana's *Vts* Patañjali discusses the purpose of the word *tasya* in the rule. He thinks, it cannot be meant simply to refer to what is called *it*, because that is clear anyway, since the whole section deals with that. Therefore we must assign a different purpose to *tasya*. When it is objected that what we have in P. 1.3.2 is the word *it*, whereas what we need in the present rule is the genitive form *itaḥ*, Patañjali points out the device of *vibhaktiviparīṇāma* 'change of case ending' which is known from ordinary language also. Two examples are quoted (*Mbh.* I, p. 264, lines 15–16). But Patañjali has something different in mind. *Lopa* is a form of *ādeśa* 'substitution' and in the case of substitution P. 1.1.52 teaches us that it takes place of the final only. However, when the question is of *lopa*–substitution in connection with what is called *it*, we want the deletion to take place of the whole, not just of the final. Examples are the groups *Ñi*, etc. mentioned in P. 1.3.5, and the group *ir* mentioned in *Vt.* IV on P. 1.3.7. To Patañjali, this is precisely why the word *tasya* has been stated in P. 1.3.9 : *lopaḥ sarvādeśaḥ yathā syāt* 'so that deletion should be the substitution of the whole' (*Mbh.* I, p. 264, line 19). How to have this purpose from *tasya* ? Patañjali says, *vacanaprāmāṇyāt* 'on the authority of the statement (of *tasya*)'. That is to say, because *tasya* happens to have been stated (*Mbh.* I, p. 264, line 20). End of discussion.

Unfortunately, the discussion is based on a misunderstanding. Patañjali has mixed up Pāṇini's *upadeśa* of technical elements with actual language forms which are subjected to grammatical operations in the course of the derivational process. The *lopa* of *it* prescribed by P. 1.3.9 is concerned with *upadeśa*, technical usage, whereas the *lopa*–substitution prescribed by P. 1.1.52 is applied to an actual language form.

4. Kātyāyana has phrased a considerable number of *Vts* on the present rule, fifteen in all. In *Vt.* VI the question of the status of the *anubandhas* is raised. On the one hand, they are there (*bhāva*). On the other hand, after *lopa* is applied, they are not there (*abhāva*). Thus they seem to combine

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

bhāva and *abhāva*, which is contradictory. The contradiction leads to *aprasiddhi* 'perplexity' on our part. As explained by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 265, lines 12–13), we do not know with what intention Pāṇini attaches *anubandhas* and then dismisses them. Here, apparently, the same confusion rules which was noted earlier in connection with Patañjali.

According to *Vt.* VII, we can manage by means of the *apavādanyāya* 'the principle that a general rule, (*utsarga*) is set aside by a special rule (*apavāda*)'. But,, as Patañjali says (*Mbh.* I, p. 265, line 15), it is not clear how to apply that principle here.

Vt. VIII returns to the point raised by *Vt.* VI and says that the presence (*bhāva*) of an *anubandha* serves to apply a grammatical operation, whereas its non–presence (after deletion) shows that no other purpose is left, requiring its presence. For instance,the *anubandha Ṇ* in the suffix *aṆ* prescribed by P. 3.2.1 causes *vṛddhi* to take place (P. 7.2.115). The *anubandha K* in the suffix *Ka* prescribed by P. 3.2.3 causes elision of the final *ā* of a verbal base (P. 6.4.64). After having served their purposes the *anubandhas* go and what is left is the ordinary language suffixal form *a* in both cases.

Vt. IX deals with the related question whether an *anubandha* should be regarded as forming an integral part (*ekānta*) of the expression concerned. The answer given here is, yes. The reason is stated as *upalabdhi* 'perception'. The *anubandha* is perceived, seen with that particular expression and not elsewhere with the same purpose. Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 265, line 21) adds an illustration : just as a branch is perceived as part of a tree, so also the *anubandha* as part of that to which it belongs.

But, if this is so, then three objections may be raised. This is what *Vt.* X does. In the first place, we have to correct a shortcoming in the *asarūpa*–rule P. 3.1.94. In the second place, we have to correct a shortcoming in the *sarvādeśa*–rule P. 1.1.55. In the third place, we have to phrase an addition to P. 1.1.20. Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 265, line 23 – p. 266, line 2) provides the examples. For the shortcoming regarding the *asarūpa*–rule reference is made to P. 3.2.1 and P. 3.2.3. Here the first rule prescribes the suffix *aṆ*, after a verbal base when in construction with an *upapada* functioning as the *karman* 'object'. Out of these two rules P. 3.2.1 is the *utsarga* 'general rule', whereas P. 3.2.3 is an *apavāda* 'special rule'. By the *apavādanyāya* P. 3.2.3 prevails over P. 3.2.1 But, according to P. 3.1.94, which holds within the section starting with *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' (P. 3.1.91), the prevalence

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

of the special rule is optional (*vā* 'preferably'), when the two suffixes in question are dissimilar in shape. Since P. 3.2.1 prescribes *aṆ* and since P. 3.2.3 prescribes *Ka*, which are dissimilar suffixes, P. 3.2.3, which is the special rule, overrules P.3.2.1, which is the general rule, only optionally. This is not desired. Therefore a qualification is to be introduced into P. 3.1.94.

For the shortcoming regarding the *sarvādeśa*–rule Patañjali refers to P. 7.1.84. This rule prescribes the substitute *auT* for *div*. According to P. 1.1.55, a substitute consisting of more than one phoneme replaces the whole of the *sthānin*. Therefore *div* would be replaced by *auT*. This is not desired. Therefore a qualification is to be introduced into P. 1.1.55.

P. 1.1.20 introduces the technical designatiou *GHU* for the verbal bases *dā*– and *dhā*– except for the verbal bases noted down as *dāP*. Here the term *adāP prima facie* excludes the base *dāP*– 'to mow'. The point made by Kātyāyana is that the base *daiP*– 'to clean' is also to be excluded. Why cannot the statement *adāP* take care of this? Because P. 6.1.45 cannot become applicable to *daiP*– in order to replace the *ai* by *ā*, since *daiP*– apparently ends in *P* and not in an *eC*– letter. Therefore, instead of *adāP*, P. 1.1.20 should read *adāpdaipau*.

Vt. XI says that, if in view of the difficulties noted, we would rather hold that the *anubandhas* do not form part of the expression concerned, then a particular type of cp.– formation (*vṛttiviśeṣa*) poses a problem. As explained by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 266, lines 6–7), reference is to cps. like *kit* or *ṇit*. These are *bv.* cps. to be analysed as *kakāra id yasya* '(that) of which the *it*– letter is *K*' and *ṇakāra id yasya* '(that) of which the *it*– letter is *Ṇ*' respectively. Here *yasya* refers to the *avayavin* 'whole', whereas *K* or *Ṇ* stands for the *avayava* 'part'. But if *K* or *Ṇ* is not part of the expression *Kit* or *Ṇit*, there cannot be an *avayava–avayavin* relation. Consequently, the *bv.* cps *Kit* or *Ṇit*, cannot be formed. Further still, the operations dependent on the conditions *Kiti* or *Ṇiti* cannot take place.

Suppose, however, that the *anubandha* in relation to the expression to which it belongs is said to to be *anantara* 'immediate', that is, immediately preceding or immediately following. Then *Vt.* XII points out that the immediately preceding or following *it*–letter might be taken with the immediately following or preceding suffix. Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 266, line 9) refers to P. 4.2.80. This rule contains an enumeration of *taddhita*–suffixes starting with *vuñchaṇ*. Here, if the relation of the *anubandha* with the suffix is defined as *ānantarya* 'immediate sequence', how do we know that the *Ñ* of *vuÑ* belongs to *vuÑ* and not to *chaṆ* (as in *ÑchaṆ*)?

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vt. XIII says that we can manage on account of reading the suffixes listed as separate forms, *vuÑ – chaṆ – Ka – ṭhaC*, etc. By introducing pauses after each suffix during recitation it will be clear to which suffix the *anubandhas* belong.

Vt. XIV produces an additional reason for the *vyavasitapāṭha* 'recitation of separate forms'. If this separation of forms is not introduced while reciting the sūtras, then, even if it is assumed that an *anubandha* forms an integral part of the expression concerned, we would still be in doubt as to which *anubandha* goes with which suffix.

Vt. XV proposes a different solution. We could decide which *anubandha* goes with what on the basis of *vṛtta* 'the derived form', that is, usage. Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 266, lines 18–19) explains that by just seeing the effects of an *anubandha* like *vṛddhi* or accentuation of the final syllable in usage we will be able to decide that a particular suffix has been marked with *Ṇ* or *K*. But this raises the question whether the *anubandha* should be regarded as *vṛttanimittaka* 'caused by usage', or whether usage should be regarded as *anubandhanimittaka* 'caused by the *anubandha*'. To Patañjali's mind there is no doubt whatsoever : the *anubandha* is *vṛttanimittaka*. The reason is that knowing the usage (of the *śiṣṭas*) Pāṇini has attached *anubandhas* (*Mbh.* I, p. 266, lines 19–21)

But do *anubandhas* form part of the expression concerned or don't they ? This is the question finally discussed by Patañjali. His idea is that they do. The reason for this is found stated by *Vt.* IX : we see *anubandhas* as part of the expressions to which they have been added. The difficulties pointed out by *Vt.* X in this respect are removed by having recourse to *jñāpaka* in all three cases (*Mbh.* I, p. 267, lines 1–6).

But, as pointed out earlier (sub 3), the question whether the *anubandhas* form part of the expression concerned, or not is to be answered by taking into consideration two types of language. In Pāṇini's *upadeśa* the *anubandhas* do form part of the expression concerned, whereas in usage they do not.

5. The *KV* follows Patañjali in explaining the purpose of the word *tasya*. It serves to indicate that the whole of what is called *it* is deleted, not just its final letter, as against P. 1.1.52. The example is P. 1.3.5.

1.3.10 YATHĀSAṂKHYAM ANUDEŚAḤ SAMĀNĀM 'the mention of (an) equal (number of) items follows the order (of enumeration)'

1. This is a *paribhāṣāsūtra*. It lays down a grammatical convention of interpretation of rules valid throughout the A. See *SA, Bh.* No. 5 and Note (6).

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

2. The *uddeśya* is *anudeśaḥ samānām*. The *vidheya* is *yathāsaṃkhyam*. By the introduction of a new incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya* any previous subject and predicate items are automatically discontinued. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

3. The *KV* explains the word *saṃkhyā* as *krama* 'order'. *Anudeśa* is literally explained as *anudiśyate* in the sense of *paścād uccāryate* 'it is stated afterwards'. *Samānām* is explained as *samānasaṃkhyānām* 'of (items) having an equal number'. In the gloss of the rule a distinction is introduced between *uddeśin* and *anudeśin*, the elements mentioned first and the elements mentioned subsequently in a given rule. As a matter of fact, rules to which P. 1.3.10 applies mention two sets each containing an equal number of elements. What P. 1.3.10 does is establishing a one–to–one correspondence between the elements of each set.

An example is the substitution rule P. 8.4.40. The set mentioned first is *stu* (*stoḥ*), the set mentioned subsequently is *ścu*. Each set contains two elements indicated as *s* and *tU* on the one hand, and as *ś* and *cU* on the other. By P. 1.3.10 the substitution prescribed by P. 8.4.40 follows the order of enumeration. Thus *s* is replaced by *ś*, and *tU* is replaced by *cU*.

In P. 8.4.40 *stu* (*stoḥ*), the set mentioned first is part of the *uddeśya*, whereas *ścu*, the set mentioned subsequently, is the *vidheya*. But this distribution of the two sets appears to be a mere coincidence.

4. It may be instructive to see how Pāṇini actually phrases his rules to indicate respective order or one–to–one correspondence. The examples are taken from the third *adhyāya*.

P. 3.1.15 mentions two noun stems as the *karman* of *vṛt-* and *car-* respectively. The noun stems have been stated in the du. abl. and the verbal bases which represent meaning–conditions have been stated in the du. gen.

P. 3.1.33 mentions two suffixes added before *lṚ* and *lUṬ* respectively. The suffixes have been stated in the du. nom. and the two *lakāras* in the du. loc.

P. 3.1.101 mentions three *nipātanas* in their successive three meanings. The *nipātanas* have been stated in the pl. nom. and the meanings in the pl. loc.

P. 3.1.117 mentions three noun stems in their successive meanings. The noun stems have stated in the pl. nom. and the meanings in the pl. loc.

P. 3.1.129 mentions four *nipātanas* in their successive meanings. The *nipātanas* have been stated in the pl. nom. and the meanings in the pl. loc.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

P. 3.2.5 mentions two *upapadas* with their respective verbal bases. The *upapadas* have been stated in the du. loc. The loc. here has been prescribed by P. 3.1.92. The verbal bases have been stated in what can only be the du. abl. although the ending is *–os*.

According to J. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, III. Bd., Göttingen 1930, p. 55, in the older part of the ṚgV. the du. abl. is perhaps also expressed by the ending *–os*. The ending *–bhyām* is attested relatively late only, in the 10th *maṇḍala* of the ṚgV. On p. 56 Wackernagel notes an abl. *–os*–ending in a passage from the *Pāraskara Gṛhya Sū.* (3.7.2).

The contrast between the third and forth *adyāyas* of the A. as regards the use of the abl. du. endings *–os* and *–bhyām* is striking. In the third *adhyāya* we count 35 instances of *–os* as against 4 instances of *–bhyām*. In the fourth *adhyāya* we count 4 instances of *–os* as against 14 of *–bhyām*. Moreover, both in the third and fourth *adhyāyas*, occasionally the sg. abl. is used for the du. or pl. abl. The distribution of the abl. *–os* and *–bhyām* endings stated above goes well with the hypothesis of a later date for the *taddhita* – section of the *A*.

P. 3.2.13 mentions two *upapadas* with their respective verbal bases, the *upapadas* in the du. loc. and the verbal bases in the du. gen.

P. 3.2.29 mentions two *upapadas* with their respective verbal bases, the *upapadas* in the du. loc. and the verbal bases in the du. gen.

P. 3.2.31 mentions two verbal bases in the du. gen. For the meaning of the case ending see under P.3.2.5. Also mentioned are an *upasarga* and a noun stem each separately, in the sg. loc. We note that here Pāṇini has not used a *dvandva* cp., *utkulayoḥ*. The point is that in Pāṇini's *upadeśa* a *dvandva* cp. conveys the sense of disjunction ('or'). But what is desired in P. 3.2.31 is the sense of conjunction. The two verbal bases mentioned are each of them to be connected with both *ud* and *kula*. Therefore, in P. 3.2.31 the question of *yathāsaṃkhyam* does not arise and the rule is wrongly referred to in *Vt.* IX on P. 1.3.10.

P. 3.2.36 mentions two *upapadas* with their respective verbal bases, the *upapadas* in the du. loc. and the verbal bases in the du. gen.

P. 3.2.41 mentions two *upapadas* with their respective verbal bases, the *upapadas* in the du. loc. and the verbal bases in the du. gen.

P. 3.2.95–96. Two separate rules. The first rule mentions an *upapada* with two verbal bases. The *upapada* has been stated in the sg. loc. The verbal bases have been stated as a *dvandva* cp. in the sg. abl. The second

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

rule mentions another *upapada*, also stated as the sg. loc., in connection with the same two verbal bases. So why not phrase one rule, *rājasahayor yudhikṛñoḥ* ? The reason is that, according to this formulation, the *upapada rājan* would be connected with *yudh*–and the *upapada saha* with *kṛÑ*. This is not desired. What we want is the connection of *rājan* with either *yudh*– or *kṛÑ*–and the connection of *saha* also with either *yudh*– or *kṛÑ*–. That is why Pāṇini had to phrase two separate rules.

P. 3.3.28 mentions two *upasargas* with their respective verbal bases. The *upasargas* – which are also *upapadas* – have been stated in the du. loc. The verbal bases have been stated in the du. gen.

P. 3.3.37 mentions two *upasargas* with their respective verbal bases, in their respective meanings. The *upasargas* have been stated in the du. loc., the verbal bases in the du. gen. and the meanings in the du. loc.

P. 3.3.86 mentions two *nipātanas* in their respective meanings. The *nipātanas* have been stated in the du. nom. The meanings have been stated in the du. loc.

P. 3.3.127 mentions two grammatical functions of noun stems in connection with two verbal bases. The functions have been stated in the du. loc. (meaning-condition). The verbal bases have stated in the du. gen.

P. 3.4.36 mentions three *upapadas* with their respective verbal bases. The *upapadas* have been stated in the pl. loc. The verbal bases have been stated as a *dvandva* cp. in the sg. abl. Here a correspondence in number is lacking.

P. 3.4.43 mentions two *upapadas* with their respective verbal bases in their respective functions. The *upapadas* have been stated in the du. loc., the verbal bases in the du. gen. and the functions in the du. loc.

P. 3.4.81 Here mention is made of two substitutes (perfect endings) with their respective *sthānins*. The substitutes have been stated as a *samāhāra dvandva* cp. in the sg. nom. The *sthānins* have been stated in du. gen.

P. 3,4.91 mentions two substitutes together with two place–conditions of the respective *sthānins* (whose preceding elements must be *s* or *v*). The substitutes have been stated in the du. nom., the conditions in the du. abl.

P. 3.4.101 mentions four substitutes with their respective *sthānins*. The substitutes have been stated in the pl. nom., the *sthānins* in the pl. gen.

A separate mention may be made of

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

P. 3.1.134 Here mention is made of three suffixes which are to be added after verbal bases belonging to three different groups, indicated by the word *-ādi*. The suffixes have been stated in the pl. nom., the verbal bases in the pl. abl. (*-ādibhyaḥ*).

P. 3.4.82 Here mention is made of nine substitutes (perfect endings) with their *sthānins*. The *sthānins*, however, have been mentioned together by means of a technical name, *parasmaipada*, which is stated in the pl. gen. Obviously, the items denoted are to be taken into account.

What are the conclusions to be drawn ? We may sum them up as follows :

a. The correspondence between the sets is usually expressed by the use of the same number, the du. or the pl. The only exception found in the third *adhyāya* in this respect is P. 3.4.36.

b. Reference, as far as correspondence is concerned, is to wordform-elements, never to meaning. That decides the question raised by *Vt.* IV (*śabdataḥ*) and *Vt.* V (*arthataḥ*). Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 269, lines 3-4) has come to the same conclusion. The one exception here is formed by technical names (*saṃjñās*), in which case meaning is to be taken into account. But meaning here consists in wordform-elements.

6. Although the word *ādi* by itself refers to many items, in a cp. representing a set of items it is to be connected with each of these items separately as forming each time one single group. The example is P. 3.1.134.

d. There is more than one type of correspondence. We note the foilowing :

1. Between a *nipātana* and a meaning-condition.

2. Between an *upapada*/*upasarga* and a verbal base.

3. Between a substitute and the *sthānin* or a condition connected with the *sthānin*.

5. Kātyāyana has phrased 27 *Vts* on the present rule. Here *Vts* VIII-XXVII deal with shortcomings in rules as regards the application of P. 1.3.10. *Vt.* XXI is rejected by *Vt.* XXII, whereas Patañjali rejects *Vts* VIII, IX, XI and XIX.

Then what about the shortcomings pointed out by the remaining *Vts* ? Patañjali's final remedy is to read the word *svaritena* from P. 1.3.11 into P. 1.3.10, as *yathāsaṃkhyam anudeśaḥ samānām svaritena* ' the mention of (an)

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

equal (number of) items by means of a *svarita* follows the order (of enumeration) ' (*Mbh.* I, p. 271, line 13).

The type of backward *anuvṛtti* proposed by Patañjali is known as *apakarṣa*. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 245, fn. 633, and earlier, *TA*, p. 125. How to obtain the retrograde *anuvṛtti* of the word *svaritena* ? The *Nyāsa* on the *KV* on the present rule explains that *yogavibhāga* ' splitting of the rule ' is to be applied to P. 1.3.11. Thus we read this rule as P. 1.3.11 (a) *svaritena* and P. 1.3.11 (b) *adhikāraḥ*. Here P. 1.3.11 (a) is to be connected with P. 1.3.10. But still, when seeing a rule marked with *svarita* we would be in doubt : is the rule concerned meant to be a *yathāsaṃkhyam* rule, or is the rule meant to be an *adhikāra* ' section heading rule ' ? Patañjali's solution to this question is to refer to *PN pb.* 1. That is to say, should the case arise, then we must exercise our judgement (*Mbh.* I, p. 271, line 16). Or, as the *KV* on the present rule puts it, *yatra neṣyate tatra svaritatvaṃ na pratijñāyate* ' where it is not desired we will not admit *svarita*–status '.

1.3.11 SVARITENĀDHIKĀRAḤ ' an *adhikāra* ' governing word (in a rule) ' is marked with the *svarita* (accent) '

1. This is a *paribhāṣāsūtra*. It lays down a convention regarding the interpretation of rules valid throughout the A. In the present case, the convention concerns the status to be assigned to a particular word in a rule.

2. The *uddeśya* is *adhikāraḥ*. The *vidheya* is *svaritena*. We note that the *vidheya* is not necessarily stated in the nom. By the introduction of a new incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya* any previous subject and predicate items are automatically discontinued. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

3. The *KV* on the present rule explains the instrum. case ending used in *svaritena* with the help of P. 2.3.21. That is to say, the *svarita* serves as the mark by which we recognize the *adhikāra*. As regards the *svarita*, reference is to P. 1.2.31. The word *adhikāra* is explained in the sense of *viniyoga* ' appointment, commission '. Thus the rule as a whole is glossed as *svaritaguṇayuktaṃ śabdarūpam adhikṛtatvād uttaratropatiṣṭhate* ' a wordform provided with *svarita*–quality presents itself in the following rule (s), because it has been given a commission '.

How do we know that a particular wordform has been marked with *svarita* ? The *KV* says *pratijñāsvaritāḥ pāṇinīyāḥ* ' the pāṇinīyas apply *svarita* (–accentuation) by convention ', just as in the case of nasality (P. 1.3.2).

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

4. The *adhikāra*-device provides a subject-wise division of the text of the A. Two well-known examples of words functioning as *adhikāra* are *aṅgasya* (P. 6.4.1), valid up to the end of the seventh *adhyāya*. and *purvatrāsiddham* (P. 8.2.1), valid up to the end of the eighth *adhyāya*. See further Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 172.

5. Kātyāyana has phrased seven *Vts* on the present rule. Two questions are discussed : what is the purpose of an *adhikāra*, and what is the extent of an *adhikāra* ?

In *Vt.* III Kātyāyana states the principle of *anuvṛtti* as *anyanirdeśas tu nivartakaḥ* ' but the mention of another (incompatible) item blocks (the earlier item) '. That is precisely why the present rule is required, namely, so that an item, a word marked as the *adhikāra*, should be continued nevertheless, and not be discontinued on account of the introduction of a new, incompatible item.

But in how many following rules will the *svarita*-marked word be continued ? That is the question raised by *Vt.* IV. In answer, *Vt.* VI quotes a statement, source unknown. The statement says *yāvatītho ' l anubandhas tāvato yogān* ' (a word marked with *svarita* governs) so many rules as (is indicated by) the so-and-so manieth speechsound (in the alphabet used) as an *anubandha*' Here *al* and *anubandhaḥ* are taken as two separate words. The idea is ingenuous. We assign a place-value to the sounds of the *nāgarī*-alphabet : *a* is 1, *i* is 2, *u* is 3, etc. Then the sound desired is added to the *adhikāra* word as an *anubandha*. From that we will know in how many rules the *adhikāra* word exerts its influence. Going by the statement recorded by Kātyāyana we infer that the convention referred to was adopted by earlier maybe pre-pāṇinian grammrians. The convention, obviously, works up to a certain point. But what if the number of rules governed exceeds the number of speechsounds in the alphabet ? *Vt.* VII finally says that, therefore the limit should be stated by means of the word *prāk* ' up to... '

6. Patañjali rejects the *Vts* VI and VII (*Mbh.* I, p. 272, lines 26-27). To Patañjali, the issue raised is really one of doubt, and in case of doubt we should exercise our judgment. Reference is to what has become *PN*, *pb*. 1. But then, why not do away with P. 1.3.11 altogether (*Mbh.* I, p. 273, line 1). This Patañjali is not willing to do. As he sees it, the rule may come in very handy. It has three purposes. First, it informs us of how an *adhikāra*-word is to be recognized. That happens by means of the *svarita*-pitch. The second

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

and third aims of the rule are described as *adhikaṃ kāryam* 'something extra is to be done' and *adhikaḥ kāraḥ* 'one who does (something) in excess (of his normal capacities)' respectively (*Mbh.* I, p 273, lines 6–7). The second aim is illustrated with the help of the designations *apādāna* (defined by P. 1.4.24, and connected with a case ending by P. 2.3.28), and *adhikaraṇa* (defined by P. 1.4.45 and connected with a case ending by P. 2.3.36). The idea is that we may assume both designations to have been marked with *svarita*. We will therefore understand that they apply beyond their proper domain as defined by the respective Pāṇinisūtras. What Patañjali means is that the designation *apādāna* also becomes applicable in instances of the ablative of comparison, and that the designation *adhikaraṇa* also becomes applicable in instances like *gaṅgāyāṃ gāvaḥ* 'the cows near the Gaṅgā' which in *alaṃkāraśāstra* come under *lakṣaṇā* (*Mbh.* I, p. 273, lines 12–17).

The third aim of P. 1.3.11, as Patañjali sees it, consists in this that it makes Kātyāyana's assumption of *pūrvaviprati*ṣ*edha* 'a conflict in which the earlier rule prevails' redundant (*Mbh.* I, p. 237, line 18). The example is *Vt.* XI on P. 7.1.95–96. Thus P. 1.3.11 is altogether a handy rule which may be invoked whenever a difficulty arises in the interpretation of application of a rule, the joker in a pack of cards.

1.3.12 ANUDĀTTAṄITA ĀTMANEPADAM '(the finite verb endings called) *ātmanepada* (are added) after (a verbal base marked with) *anudātta* (pitch) or with (the *anubandha*) *Ṅ*'

1. This is a *niyamasūtra*, a rule which imposes a restriction in the sense that after the verbal bases mentioned the *ātm.* endings are added only, not the endings called *parasmaipada*.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ*) *anudāttaṅitaḥ*. The *vidheya* is *ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* and *vidheya* any previous subject and predicate items are automatically cancelled. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

3. In the translation of the rule stated above the word *dhātoḥ* taken from P. 3.1.91 is supplied on the basis of *sāmarthya*, that is, because otherwise the rule would not make sense. What is called *ātmanepada* are finite verb endings, and they come after a verbal base only.

4. The definition of the endings called *ātmanepada* is introduced later in P. 1.4.100, as *taṅānau* '*taṄ* and *āna*'. Here *taṄ* is the *pratyāhāra*

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

'abbreviative designation' for the nine endings called *ātmanepada*, whereas *āna* is the *ātm.* participle morpheme, as in *ŚānaC* (P. 3.2.124) and *KānaC* (P. 3.2.106).

5. The *KV* following Kātyāyana glosses the rule as *aviśeṣeṇa dhātor ātmanepadaṃ parasmaipadaṃ ca vidhāsyate. Tatrāyaṃ niyamaḥ kriyate. Anudātte tu ye dhātavo ñitaś ca tebhya eva ātmanepadaṃ bhavati nānyebhyaḥ* 'after a verbal base (the endings called) *ātmanepada* and *parasmaipada* will be prescribed indiscriminately (by P. 3.4.78). This being so, the following restriction is made. (The endings called) *ātmanepada* are added after those verbal bases only which are marked with *anudātta* (pitch) and with *Ṅ*, not after other (verbal bases)'.

6. Why this rule – and, for that matter, the whole section on *ātmanepada* endings – should come here, is not clear. The connection with P. 1.3.1 can be described as loose only. A more suitable place would be at the end of the third *adhyāya*.

7. According to *Vts* I and II, the present rule is to be understood as imposing a *niyama* 'restriction'. The reason is that the finite verb endings have already been prescribed by P. 3.4.78. So what is the point in prescribing the *ātm.* endings again by P. 1.3.12? To make this rule purposeful, it is assumed that P. 1.3.12 is a restrictive rule.

It is in this connection that Patañjali brings in the question of the *vikaraṇas*, wordform elements that occur between the verbal base and the finite verb ending. The *vikaraṇas* have been prescribed by P. 3.1.33–81. They come in two types, *ārdhadhātuka vikaraṇas* and *sārvadhātuka vikaraṇas*. The *sārvadhātuka vikaraṇas* are conditioned by the presence of finite verb endings. So they are definitely added after the finite verb endings have been added. But the *ārdhadhatuka vikaraṇas* (with the exception of *yaK*, P. 3.1.67) are not conditioned in this way. Therefore their addition poses a problem.

Tradition knows the *pb. vikaraṇebhyo niyamo baliyān* '(a rule imposing) a restriction prevails over (rules prescribing) *vikaraṇas*' (*PN*, pb. 41). Hereby the rules prescribing *ātm.* (and *parasmaipada*) endings take precedence over rules prescribing *vikaraṇas*. Nāgeśa, in his commentary on *pb.* 41 (*PN*, Part I, p. 70, lines 5–6) notes a view which says *vikaraṇavyavadhāne 'pi niyama-pravṛttiḥ* 'even when *vikaraṇas* intervene, a rule imposing a restriction can be applied'. Obviously, this view assumes that the *vikaraṇas* are added first.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

In the present context, however, the problem is posed by the word *anudāttaṅitaḥ* in P. 1.3.12. This is a technical ablative, as prescribed by P. 1.1.67. Therefore the *ātm.* endings should come immediately after the verbal base. Then how can the *vikaraṇas* intervene? Patañjali offers two reasons why the *vikararaṇas* should be added first: they have been prescribed by the later rules than the *ātm.* endings, and, in a case of conflict, the later rule prevails (by P.1.4.2); and the *vikaraṇas* are *nitya* 'invariably applicable', that is, whether the *ātm.* endings are applied or not (*Mbh.* I. p. 274, lines 17–20).

Clearly, Patañjali's appeal to *paratva* 'the prevalence of the later rule' as a conflict-solving principle which he takes to be applicable throughout the A. does not work, because it involves many exceptions in the form of *pūrva-vipratiṣedha* 'conflict (solved) by (assuming the prevalence of) the earlier (rule)'. As is known, this finally leads Patañjali to interpret the word *para* in the sense of *iṣṭa* 'desired' (*Mbh.* I. p. 306, line 8). As regards the appeal to *nityatva*, we note that this is closely related to *siddhatva*. According to the *siddha*-principle, given a case of conflict, that rule is to be applied first which destroys the *nimitta* 'cause (of application)' of the other rule. See Joshi–Roodbergen 1987, p. 542–3, and *AP* I. p. 87. In our case, since the *vikaraṇa*-rules destroy the *nimitta* of the rules prescribing the *ātm.* endings, they will be applied first. As a consequence, the rules prescribing the *ātm.* endings cannot be applied. This is clearly not desired.

How to solve this problem? Or rather, what could be the pāṇinian solution to this problem?

Actually, the relation between the rules prescribing *vikaraṇas* and the rules prescribing the *ātm.* (and *parasmaipada*) endings is not be construed as an instance of *paravipratiṣedha* 'a conflict in which the later rule prevails', but as an *utsarga–apavāda* relation. The point is that the *vikaraṇas* are prescribed after each and every verbal base, whereas the *ātm.* (and *parasmaipada*) endings have been prescribed after specific verbal bases only. Therefore, in relation to the *vikaraṇa*-rules the rules prescribing the finite verb endings are to be considered as *apavādas* 'special rules'. That is why they take precedence.

One example. P. 3.1.43 says *cli luṅi* 'when (the verb endings called) *lUṄ* follow, (the *vikaraṇa*) *cli* (is added)'. That is to say, *dhātoḥ luṅi cli* 'when *lUṄ* (is added) after a verbal base, *cli* (is added to that base)'. Here the *uddeśya* is *dhatoḥ luṅi*. The *vidheya* is *cli*. Now consider P. 1.3.12 in connection with *lUṄ*. In that case the rule may be interpreted to mean

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

anudāttaṅitaḥ dhātoḥ ātmanepadam 'after a verbal base which is marked with *anudātta* or *Ṅ* the *ātm.* endings are substituted for *lUṄ*'. Here the *uddeśya* is *anudāttaṅitaḥ dhātoḥ luṅaḥ*, whereas the *vidheya* ia *ātmanepadam*. On comparing the two *uddeśyas* it is clear that *anudāttaṅitaḥ dhātoḥ luṅaḥ* is the more restricted one. Therefore, in relation to the *cli* rule, the *ātmanepada* rule assumes the status of *apavāda* 'special rule'. That is why the *ātmanepada* rule prevails. But then, how can the *vikaraṇas* be still added ?

The answer is that properties like *luṅ-tva* which belong to the *sthānin lUṄ*, etc. are extended to the *ātm.* endings by *sthānivadbhāva* (P. 1.1.56). Therefore, since the *vikaraṇas* are conditioned by *luṅ-tva*, etc., they can still be added after *lUṄ*, etc. have been replaced by the *ātm.* endings.

Two more points in this connection. First, the *utsarga-apavāda* principle is stronger even than the *siddha*-principle. Secondly, whereas Pāṇini defines *asiddha* (as opposed to *siddha*), he is silent about the *utsarga-apavāda* relation. The reason must be that this latter relation is a *laukika* one, seen in daily life, and therefore not in need of a grammatical definition.

8. *Vts* III and V deal with the question whether the *niyama* 'restriction' imposed by P. 1.3.12 is a *pratyayaniyama* or a *prakṛtyarthaniyama*. By *pratyayaniyama* a restriction is meant regarding the use of suffixes in the sense they are allowed after certain verbal bases only. The word *prakṛtyarthaniyama* is a *dvandva* cp. to be analysed as *prakṛtiniyamo 'rthaniyamaś ca* 'a restriction regarding verbal bases or a restriction regarding meaning'. The meaning concerned here is that of suffixes. The restriction itself is expressed by the word *eva*. Here the position of the word *eva* becomes all-important. A Sanskrit dictum says *yata evakāras tato 'nyatra niyamaḥ* 'the restriction holds for (items) other than the one after which the word *eva* (has been added)'. Compare *TA*, Note (167) and *PRATI*, Note (6).

If P. 1.3.12 is taken as a *pratyayaniyama*, the rule is interpreted to mean *anudāttaṅitaḥ dhātoḥ eva ātmanepadam* 'the *ātm.* endings are added after a verbal base marked with *anudātta* or *Ṅ* only'. What is excluded here are *ātm.* endings after other verbal bases than the ones specified. In this interpretation the rule does not say anything about *parasmaipada* endings. For all we know, they may be added also. That is precisely the difficulty. To remove it, Kātyāyana says, the word *śeṣāt* 'after the remaining (verbal bases not mentioned so far)' is to be read in P. 1.3.78 which deals with *parasmaipada* endings. As a matter of fact, P. 1.3.78 contains the word *śeṣāt*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

If P. 1.3.12 is taken as a *prakṛtyarthaniyama*, the rule is interpreted to mean *anudāttaṅitaḥ dhātoḥ ātmanepadam eva* 'after a verbal base marked with *anudātta* or *Ṅ* the *ātm.* endings only are added'. What is excluded here are any other suffixes than the *ātm.* endings, like, for example, *kṛt*-suffixes. That is precisely the difficulty. Patañjali's solution here is to declare *anavakāśatva* 'lack of scope (of application)' for the *kṛt*-suffixes, and then justify their application on the strength of their having been prescribed (*vacanāt*, *Mbh.* I, p. 276, line 3).

Vts VI and VII point out two instances of *gaurava* in the *pratyayaniyama*-alternative, namely, the requirement of the word *śeṣāt* in P. 1.3.78 and the additional requirement of the word *śeṣe* in the same rule. The latter requirement is subsequently rejected by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 277, 2). But the first requirement is upheld, whereas it is stated that in the *prakṛtyarthaniyama*-alternative we can do away with the the word *śeṣāt* in P. 1.3.78 (*Mbh.* I, p. 276, lines 26-27).

Patañjali does not explicitly say which of the two alternatives is preferable. But Nāgeśa (on *Bh.* No. 50, *NSP* ed.) says that the *prakṛtyarthaniyama*- alternative is the best one. The reason is that it involves relatively less *gaurava* 'prolixity'. The *KV*, however. accepts the *pratyayaniyama*- alternative.

9. One example quoted by the *KV* is *śete* 'he sleeps'. The verbal base concerned has been marked with *Ṅ* in the *Dhātupāṭha*. The derivation is as follows :

(1) *śīṄ*		*Dhātup.* 2.22
(2) *śī*	+ *lAṬ*	P. 3.2.123
(3) *śī*	+ *ta*	P. 3.4.78
(4) *śe*	+ *ta*	P. 7.4.21
(5) *śe* + *ŚaP*	+ *ta*	P. 3.1.68
(6) *śe* + °	+ *ta*	P. 2.4.72
(7) *śe*	+ *te*	P. 3.4.79
śete.		

1.3.13 BHĀVAKARMAṆOḤ '(the endings called *ātmanepada* are added after a verbal base) to express the sense of *bhāva* "impersonal action" or of *karman* "action in the passive"'.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1. As stated by the *Nyāsa* on the *KV* here, this is another *niyamasūtra* 'rule imposing a restriction'. The restriction is of the *pratyayaniyama* type. That is to say, we will interpret the rule as *bhāvakarmaṇor evātmanepadam* 'in the sense of *bhāva* or of *karman* exclusively (we will add) the *ātm.* endings'. The question is, what is excluded by the use of the word *eva* here? The answer is, the sense of *kartṛ* 'agent'. We note that in this interpretation nothing is said about other suffixes which may be added to express the same senses. The alternative view is called *arthaniyama* 'restriction regarding (the) meaning (of suffixes)' by the *Nyāsa*. It has to be phrased as *bhāvakarmaṇor ātmanepadam eva* 'in the sense of *bhāva* or *karman*, the *ātm.* endings (are added) only'. This would exclude any other suffixes from conveying these senses. That is precisely the difficulty. As pointed out by the *Nyāsa*, we would have difficulty in justifying phrases like *ko bhavatā dāyo dattaḥ* 'which gift has been given by you?', or *ko bhavatā lābho labdhaḥ* 'which gain has been made by you?'. Here the words *dāya* and *lābha* are derived with the *kṛt*-suffix *GHaÑ* in the sense of *karman* by P. 3.3.19. But that would not be possible, if the *arthaniyama* interpretation of P. 1.3.13 is accepted. That is why the *pratyayaniyama*-alternative is preferred.

2. The word *anudāttañitaḥ* from P. 1.3.12 is discontinued on the basis of *sāmarthya*. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 45–46. The argument is that, since P. 1.3.12 does not contain any meaning-condition, the *ātm.* endings after the bases specified could convey the sense of *bhāva* or *karman*. Consequently, if *anudāttañitaḥ* were continued in P. 1.3.13, the mention of *bhāvakarmaṇoḥ* would be futile. Therefore, to make this mention purposeful, we assume that *anudāttañitaḥ* is not continued in P. 1.3.13. The word *ātmanepadam* is continued from P. 1.3.12, because there is nothing to cancel it. For the word *dhātoḥ* see P. 1.3.12, under 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ*), for which see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The *vidheya* is *bhāvakarmaṇoḥ* (*ātmanepadam*). *Bhāva* and *karman* are grammatical-functional meanings which are assigned to suffixes, in our case the *ātm.* endings.

4. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

5. In its gloss the *KV* refers to P. 3.4.69. This rule introduces a distinction between transitive and intransitive verbal bases. It says that the suffixes called *l* are added after (transitive) verbal bases to express the sense of *karman* 'action in the passive' (as well as that of *kartṛ* 'agent'), and that they are added after intransitive bases to express the sense of *bhāva* 'impersonal action' (as well as that of *kartṛ*). The point is that hereby

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

both the *parasmaipada* and *ātm.* endings could be used indiscriminately to convey both senses. But P. 1.3.13 restricts them to being conveyed by *ātm.* endings.

6. The *KV* quotes examples for (1) *bhāva* 'impersonal action', (2) *karman* 'action in the passive' and (3) *karmakartṛ* 'the agent-treated-like-object construction'. This latter construction is a Sanskrit idiom to express the the extreme ease with which an action is performed. No passive sense is implied, only a passive verb morphology (*yaK*, P. 3.1.67). Some of the examples are :

(1) *supyate bhavatā* 'it is slept by you'. What is conveyed by the use of the *ātm.* ending here is the mere act of sleeping. The *anabhihitakartṛ* is put in the instr. by P. 2.3.18.

(2) *kriyate kaṭaḥ* 'the mat is made'. What is conveyed by the use of the *ātm.* ending is the sense of action in the passive, that is, of the passivized grammatical object. Since this sense has already been conveyed by the *ātm.* ending, it is not to be expressed again by the accusative ending after the word *kaṭa*. This is prohibited by P. 2.3.1.

(3) *lūyate kedāraḥ svayam eva* (or *lūyate kedāraḥ*) 'the meadow mows of its own'. The relevant rule is P. 3.1.87. It says that an agent who is engaged in an action in a way equal to that of the *karman* 'object' is treated like the *karman*. In the example, as far as linguistic expression is concerned, the meadow is presented as *the svatantrakartṛ* 'independent agent' of the action of mowing. Really speaking, however, a meadow cannot be the *svatantra* agent of an action. Thus here we experience a clash between representation in language and reality. It is from this clash that the intention of ease or smoothness of action comes to our mind. Here what grammar has to say about the linguistic expression is that the item which is presented as the agent is treated like a *karman*. To express the sense of *karman*, when the question is of a *karmakartṛ*. the *ātm.* endings are used by P. 1.3.13, so the *KV* says. Accordingly, by P. 2.3.1, the word *kedāraḥ* in the example appears in the nominative.

7. Expressions like *laḥ kartari* '(the suffixes called) *l* (are added after a verbal base) to express the sense of *kartṛ*', and *laḥ karmaṇi* '(the suffixes called) *l* (are added after a verbal base) to express the sense of *karman* imply that the sense of *kartṛ* or of *karman* is *abhihita* '(already) expressed', namely, by the suffixes in question. Therefore the items functioning as the *kartṛ* or *karman* are put in the nominative. That is to say, after these items the

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

nominative case is added, because this is the case ending to which no specific syntactic meaning has been assigned (P. 2.3.1; 2.3.46, *prātipadikārtha*). Thus we can account for syntactic agreement in sentences like *puruṣaḥ karoti* 'the man acts', *puruṣau kurutaḥ* 'the two men act', *puruṣāḥ kurvanti* 'the men (pl.) act', *kaṭaḥ kriyate* 'the mat is made', *kaṭau kriyete* 'the two mats are made', *kaṭāḥ kriyante* 'the mats (pl.) are made'.

On the other hand, the expression *laḥ bhāve* '(the suffixes called) *l* (are added after a verbal base) to express the sense of *bhāva*' implies that the sense of *kartṛ* or of *karman* is *anabhihita* 'not (already) expressed' by the suffixes in question. Thus there will be no syntactic agreement between the item functioning as the agent and the verb form. The question of an item functioning as the *karman* does not arise, because *la* – suffixes in the sense of *bhāva* are added after intransitive bases only. The verb is invariably used in the 3rd sg. Thus we have usages like *āsyate puruṣeṇa* 'it is sat by the man', *āsyate puruṣābhyām* 'it is sat by the two men' and *āsyate puruṣaiḥ* 'it is sat by the men (pl.)'.

Why a third sg. only ? First of all, we have to apply the *vikaraṇa yaK*, by P. 3.1.67, This rule says that when a *sārvadhātuka* suffix conveying the sense of *bhāva* or *karman* follows, the *vikaraṇa yaK* is added after a verbal base. According to *Vt.* III on P. 3.1.67, the same *vikaraṇa yaK* is also added when the sense to be conveyed is that of *karmakartṛ*. The *SK*, No. 2756, on P. 3.1.67 further explains that the use of the second and first persons requires *sāmānādhikaraṇya* 'syntactic agreement'. Reference is to P. 1.4.105 and 107. But when *bhāva* is expressed by the finite verb ending, the question of syntactic agreement does not arise. Therefore only the third person can be used, by P. 1.4.108 (*śeṣe prathamaḥ*). Moreover, the expression of *bhāva* is indifferent as regards number. *Bhāva* is not a countable entity of which there can be two or more. Therefore the question of dual or plural number does not arise. What remains is the singular number which, since it comes as a number independent of counting, must come by some general rule to be phrased *ad hoc*. And finally, to express an agent which is *anabhihita* 'not (already) expressed' by the finite verb ending, we use the instrumental by P. 2.3.18.

8. For the meanings in which Pāṇini has used the word *bhāva* see *PRATI*, p. 91. Compare also *VIBHA*, fn. 259 for a passage quoted from *Nirukta* 1.1 in which the difference in meaning conveyed by an action noun like *pāka* and a finite verbform like *pacati* is investigated. The common element

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

in Pāṇini's uses of the term *bhāva* appears to be the absence of the idea of process or change, and the presence of a durable state.

9. The *KV* finally says that in the rule prescribing the *parasmaipada* endings (P. 1.3.78) a second mention of the word *kartṛ* is to be made. Thus the rule should read *śeṣāt kartari kartari parasmaipadam* '(the endings called) *parasmaipada* (are added after a verbal base) not mentioned so far to express a *kartṛ* which is a *kartṛ* only '. Thereby a *kartṛ* which is also a *karman* is excluded. The idea of reading the word *kartari* twice in P. 1.3.78 goes back to Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 277, line 16). The *Nyāsa* on the *KV* on the present rule explains that the second mention of *kartari* in P. 1.3.78 is based on *anuvṛtti* of the word *kartari* from P. 1.3.13.

Actually, this second mention of *kartari* in P. 1.3.78 is not required. Since the *kartṛ* who happens to be a *karmakartṛ* is treated like a *karman* by P. 3.1.87, the *ātm.* endings are to be applied by P. 1.3.13. There is no need for an additional prohibition of *parasmaipada* endings.

1.3.14 KARTARI KARMAVYATIHĀRE '(the *ātm.* endings are added after a verbal base) in the sense of *kartṛ* " agent ", when the question is of exchange/reciprocity of action '

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. It prescribes a grammatical operation, namely, the addition of the *ātm.* endings on two conditions.

2. The meaning-condition *bhāvakarmaṇoḥ* from P. 1.3.13 is cancelled by the meaning-condition *kartari*. The word *ātmanepadam* is continued from P. 1.3.12. For the word *dhātoḥ* ' after a verbal base ' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ*) *karmavyatihāre*. The *vidheya* is *kartari* (*ātmanepadam*).

The question may be raised whether meaning-conditions form part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya*. Here a distinction should be made between purely semantic meanings (lexical meanings) and grammatical meanings. Lexical meanings belong to the verbal base or to the noun stem. If they belong to the verbal base, they may be said to be brought out or revealed by the use of the *ātm.* endings. In that case, the *ātm.* endings are *dyotaka* ' revealer '. Grammatical meanings, like *kartṛ* ' agent ', *karman* ' object ' or *bhāva* ' impersonal action ', belong to suffixes, in our case the *ātm.* endings. That is why in the present rule the condition *karmavyatihāre* is considered to be part of the *uddeśya*, whereas the condition *kartari* is considered to be part of the *vidheya*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

4. The *KV* explains the word *karman* in *karmavyatihāre* as conveying the *laukika* sense of *kriyā* 'action'. It therefore does not convey the technical, grammatical sense of 'grammatical object' here. This is in agreement with the meaning of the word *vyatihāre*, explained by the *KV* as *vinimaya* 'exchange', which is a *laukika* meaning only.

The idea of *karmavyatihāra* is that A performs an action usually associated with B, whereas B performs an action usually associated with A. But, as explained by the *Padamañjarī* here, *parasparakaraṇam api karmavyatihāra ucyate* 'reciprocity also is called *karmavyatihāra*'. The example (borrowed from Patañjali's *bhāṣya* on P. 1.3.15, *Mbh.* I, p. 279, line 2) is *saṃpraharante rājānaḥ* 'the kings atttack each other'. Thus the word *karmavyatihāra* covers two different concepts.

5. Patañjali devotes half of his *bhāṣya* on the present rule to argue that *karman* in *karmavyatihāra* means *kriyā* 'action'. At the end of the discussion he says that we could have managed by simply phrasing the rule as *kartarī vyatihāre*. But since Pāṇini chose to phrase the rule as *kartari karmavyatihāre*, he must have done so to make clear that the rule applies when the question is of an axchange/reciprocity of action, and not of an exchange/reciprocity of the object (of an action) (*Mbh.* I, p. 278, lines 5–6).

In the course of the discussion it is argued that a *kriyā* 'action' may also be the thing most desired to be reached by means of an action. This is one of Patañjali's stock arguments, for which see *KARA. Bh.* No. 13 on P. 1.4.32, and Note (86).

6. In the A. the locative ending is used in three different meanings at least. We note the following :

a. The locative word indicates the element immediately before which a grammatical operation becomes applicable (P. 1.1.66).

b. The locative form indicates the word or words whose presence as a co-occurring word or as co-occurring words conditions a grammatical operation. An example is P. 3.2.5.

c. The locative word denotes a meaning–condition, 'in the sense of'. Here the meaning concerned may be a grammatical one, for example, *kartarī* (P. 1.3.14), *bhāvakarmaṇoḥ* (P. 1.3.13), *bhūte* (P. 3.2.84). Or the meaning concerned may be a purely semantic one, as happens when a grammatical operation becomes applicable when a particular word–meaning is to be signified.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The words put in the locative themselves may form part of Pāṇini's *upadeśa* only, as in the case of *kñiti* (P. 1.1.5) or *aśiti* (P. 6.1.45). Or they may form part of Pāṇini's *upadeśa* without being defined in terms of his *upadeśa*, as in the case of *bhāvakarmaṇoḥ* (P. 1.3.13). Or, finally, they may simply be non-technical, *laukika* words, as in the case of *karmavyatihāre* (P. 1.3.14)

7. Kātyāyana has phrased 3 *Vts* on the present rule. Here he discusses the purpose of the word *kartari* in the rule. In *Vt.* I he says that the purpose of the mention of *kartari* is to block the addition of *ātm.* endings in the sense of *bhāva* or of *karman*, when the question is of *karmavyatihāra*. The reason is stated by *Vt.* II. Otherwise, that is, if *kartari* is not mentioned and if, consequently, the condition *bhāvakarmaṇoḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.13, then a prohibition of P. 1.3.14 (as in P. 1.3.15–16) would entail the prohibition of the senses of *bhāva* and *karman*. This is not desired. One of the examples quoted by Patañjali here is *vyatihanyante dasyavaḥ* 'the Dasyu's are killed one by the other'. But the reason stated by *Vt.* II is rejected by *Vt.* III which says *anantarasya pratiṣedhāt* 'because (a rule only) forbids that which is nearest (to it)'. Thereby the prohibitions stated by P. 1.3.15–16 will only forbid the application of *ātm.* endings by P. 1.3.14, but not the application of *ātm.* endings by the more remote rule P. 1.3.13. The statement *anantarasya pratiṣedhāt* has been later on included in *PN, pb.* 61. Patañjali accordingly concludes that, in fact, the mention of the word *kartari* in P. 1.3.14 is not required (*Mbh.* I, p. 278, line 18). He repeats that, however, a second mention of the word *kartari* in P. 1.3.78 is needed (*Mbh.* I, p. 278, lines 19-20; see P. 1.3.13, sub 8).

7. As regards the order and formulation of the rules P. 1.3.12–14 we note that the rules are better ordered and phrased as follows :

P. 1.3.12 *bhāvakarmaṇor ātmanepadam*

P. 1.3.13 *kartary anudāttaṅitaḥ*

P. 1.3.14 *karmavyatihāre ca*

The main advantage is that in this way the word *kartari* will be continued in the whole *pāda* up to P. 1.4.1.

1.3.15 NA GATIHIṂSĀRTHEBHYAḤ '(the *ātm.* endings in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" are) not (added after verbal bases) having the sense of *gati* "going" or of *hiṃsā* "injury" (when the question is of exchange/reciprocity of action)'

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1. This is a prohibition (*pratiṣedha*). What is prohibited is the use of the *ātm.* endings in given cases.

2. The word *ātmanepadam* is continued from P. 1.3.12. The words *kartari karmavyatihāre* are continued from P. 1.3.14. For the word *dhātoḥ* (= *dhātubhyaḥ*, with the required change of number) see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātubhyaḥ*) *gatihiṃsārthebhyaḥ karmavyatihāre.* The *vidheya is kartari na ātmanepadam.* Compare P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

4. The *KV* on the present rule explains the cp. *gatihiṃsārthebhyaḥ* as *gatyarthebhyaḥ* 'after (verbs) having the sense of *gati* ' and *hiṃsārthebhyaḥ* 'after (verbs) having the sense of *hiṃsā* '.

5. The examples offered by the *KV* here are *vyatigacchanti* 'they go mutually ', *vyatisarpanti* 'they crawl mutually ', *vyatihiṃsanti* 'they injure each other ' and *vyatighnanti* 'they kill each other '.

6. Kātyāyana has phrased two *Vts* on the present rule. *Vt.* I says that inclusion (in the prohibition) is to be made of the *hasādi* verbal bases. The base *hasE hasane* has been mentioned in the *Dhp.* 1. 757. According to Kaiyaṭa on *Bh.* No. 1 on the present rule, *hasādi* means *hasiprakārāḥ śabdakriyāḥ* 'verbs of (making a) sound of the type of *has–*. ' Thereby Kaiyaṭa makes it clear that *hasādi* is not a group based on the *Dhātupāṭha.* Patañjali provides the examples *vyatihasanti* 'they laugh at each other ', *vyatijalpanti* 'they gossip about each other ' and *vyatipaṭhanti* 'they recite each other's portions ' (*Mbh.* I, p. 278, lines 24–25).

Vt. II says that the prohibition does not hold for the bases *hṛ–* and *vah–*. Patañjali provides the examples *saṃpraharante rājānaḥ* 'the kings attack each other ' and *saṃvivahante gargaiḥ* 'they intermarry with the Garga's ' (*Mbh.* I, p. 279, lines 2–3).

1.3.16 ITARETARĀNYONYOPAPADĀC CA 'also (the *ātm.* endings in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" are) not (added after a verbal base) which has *itaretara* "one another" or *anyonya* "each other" as an *upapada* "adjoining word" (when the question is of exchange/reciprocity of action)'

1. This is a prohibition (*pratiṣedha*). What is prohibited is the use of the *ātm.* endings in specified cases.

2. To the word *ca* in the present rule two functions may be assigned. First, it marks the boundary with the preceding rule (P. 1.3.15) with which otherwise P. 1.3.15 might have formed one rule. See Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 36, 244. Secondly, *ca* connects the preceding rule with the present rule in the

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

sense that the present rule is also a *pratiṣedha*. Therefore here *ca* has a function in continuing the prohibitive particle *na*.

3. The word *ātmanepadam* is continued from P. 1.3.12. The words *kartari karmavyatihāre* are continued from P. 1.3.14. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

4. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ*) *itaretarānyonyopapadāt* (*karmavyatihāre*). The *vidheya* is (*kartari na ātmanepadam*). Compare P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

5. The *KV* on the present rule connects the word *upapada* with both *itaretara* and *anyonya*. Here the word *upapada* is not used in its technical sense as defined by P. 3.1.92. It simply means an adjoining word. The examples offered by the *KV* are *itaretarasya vyatilunanti* and *anonyasya vyatilunanti* both meaning 'they mow each other's (grain)'. The word supplied is *dhānyam* 'grain'.

6. Kātyāyana has phrased one *Vt.* on the present rule. It says *parasparopapadāc ca* 'also after (a verbal base) which has *paraspara* "one another" as an *upapada*'. Here the word *ca* also serves to group together two rules.

According to the *Nyāsa* on the *KV* here, the word *ca* is *anuktasamuccayārtha* 'conveying the meaning of inclusion of what was left unstated'. Thereby the author of the *Nyāsa* indicates that, in his view, *Vt.* I is not required. The point is that the word *ca* in P. 1.3.16 makes the inclusion of other cases possible.

7. The examples offered by Patañjali are *parasparasya vyatilunanti* 'they mow each other's (grain)' and *parasparasya vyatipunanti* 'they winnow each other's (grain)' (*Mbh.* I, p. 279, lines 6–7).

1.3.17 NER VIŚAḤ '(the *ātm.* endings in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" are added) immediately after (the verbal base) *viś-* "to enter" immediately preceded by (the preverb) *ni*'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. It prescribes a grammatical operation, namely, the addition of the *ātm.* endings after a given verbal base.

Viś- is mentioned in the *Dhātup.* (6.130) as a base marked with *udātta*. Therefore, normally, it will take the *parasmaipada* endings, as can be inferred from P. 1.3.12, 1.3.72 and 1.3.78. It follows that a separate rule is required for *viś-* taking the *ātm.* endings. As a matter of fact, this holds for all verbal bases mentioned up to P. 1.3.78.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

2. The prohibitive particle *na* from P. 1.3.15-16 is discontinued. If Pāṇini had wanted to continue *na* in the present rule, he would have grouped this rule with P. 1.3.14–15 by means of the word *ca*. See P. 1.3.16, sub 2. In that case, P. 1.3.17 would have read *viśaś ca neḥ*. Since Pāṇini did not do so, we conclude that the prohibition is not continued.

3. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and P. 1.3.14 respectively. The condition *karmavyatihāre* is cancelled, because there is nothing to indicate that the present rule is to be grouped with P. 1.3.14-16. For the word *dhātoḥ* see P. 1.3.12 sub 3.

4. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ*) *ner viśaḥ*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*).

5. The ablative *neḥ* is a technical ablative as defined by P. 1.1.67. Accordingly, *viś–* must follow immediately after *ni*, or, reversely, *viś–* must be immediately preceded by *ni*.

6. The ablative *viśaḥ* is also a technical ablative as defined by P. 1.1.67. Accordingly, the *ātm.* endings must come immediately after the verbal base. For the question of the *vikaraṇas* see P. 1.3.12, sub 7.

7. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

8. The examples offered by the *KV* are *niviśate* 'he enters' and *niviśante* 'they enter'. The purpose of the mention of *ni* is made clear by the counterexample *praviśati* 'he enters' (*parasmaipada* ending).

9. The *KV* points out that the designation *dhātu* which applies to *viś–* also includes *viś–* when preceded by the augment *aṬ* (P. 6.4.71). Therefore *aṬ* is not considered to be an intervening element which disrupts the required immediate sequence of *ni* and *viś–*. The example offered by the *KV* is *nyaviśata* 'he entered'.

10. Finally, the *KV* makes it clear that by *ni* the *upasarga ni* is meant, not just any arbitrary sequence *n – i*. Reference in this respect is to *PN, pb.* 14. The counterexample is *madhuni viśanti bhramarāḥ* 'the bees enter the honey'.

1.3.18 PARIVYAVEBHYAḤ KRIYAḤ '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") immediately after (the verbal base) *krī–* "to barter" immediately preceded by (the preverbs) *pari, vi* or *ava*'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ*) *parivyavebhyaḥ kriyaḥ*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). The previous part– *uddeśya ner viśaḥ* is automatically discontinued by the incompatible new part– *uddeśya parivyavebhyaḥ kriyaḥ*. Compare Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

4. For the ablatives used in the rule see P. 1.3.17, sub 5 and 6. For the argument *aṬ* see P. 1.3.17, sub 9.

5. Reference is to the verbal base *ḌUkrīÑ dravyavinimaye* (*Dhātupāṭha* 9.1). As stated by the *KV*, the effect of the *anubandha Ñ* is that the *ātm.* endings will be added when the question is of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphalam* 'the result of the action benefitting the agent' (P. 1.3.72). Therefore the present rule, must have been phrased so that *krī–* (preceded by *pari*, etc.) takes the *ātm.* endings even when the question is not of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale*.

6. The abl. of the verbal base form *krī–* follows the declension of monosyllabic noun stems in *–ī*, like *dhī*.

7. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

8. The examples offered by the *KV* are *parikrīṇīte* 'he hires', *vikrīṇīte* 'he sells' and *avakrīṇīte* 'he purchases'.

9. The *KV* points out that by *pari*, etc. the *upasargas pari*, etc, are meant, not just any arbitrary sequence *p–a–r–i*, etc. The counterexample is *bahuvi krīṇāti vanam* 'he buys a forest containing many birds'. Compare P. 1.3.17, sub 9.

1.3.19 VIPARĀBHYĀṂ JEḤ '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") immediately after (the verbal base) *ji–* "to conquer" immediately preceded by (the preverbs) *vi* or *parā* '.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ*) *viparibhyāṃ jeḥ*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). The previous part– *uddeśya parivyavebhyaḥ kriyaḥ* is automatically discontinued by the new, incompatible part– *uddeśya viparābhyāṃ jeḥ*. Compare Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

4. For the ablatives used in the rule see P. 1.3.17, sub 5 and 6. For the argument regarding the augment *aṬ* see P. 1.3.17, sub 8.

5. We note that in *viparābhyām* the du. abl. ending *-bhyām* is used, and not the older ending *-os*, for which see P. 1.3.10, sub 4, and P. 3.2.5.

6. Patañjali, in his *bhāṣya* on the present rule, wonders whether the mention of the *upasarga parā* is necessary in order to prevent the application of the rule in the expression *parā jayati senā* 'the stronger army wins'. But then he rejects this idea. The mention of *vi*, which is undoubtedly an *upasarga*, in a *dvandva* cp. with *parā* makes it sufficiently clear that the word *parā* in the rule can only refer to the *upasarga parā* and not to the fem. adj. *parā*. By way of illustration Patañjali then says *asya gor dvitīyenārtha iti gaur evopādīyate naśvo na gardabha iti* '(given the statement) "this ox needs a second one" an ox only is offered, not a horse, nor an ass' (*Mbh.* I, p. 279, lines 12–13).

1.3.20 ĀṄO DO 'NĀSYAVIHARAṆE '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") immediately after (the verbal base) *dā-* "to give" immediately preceded by (the preverb) *āṄ*, except in the sense of opening the mouth'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *āṅo* (*dhātoḥ*) *daḥ anāsyaviharaṇe*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). Compare P. 1.3.14, sub 3. By the introduction of a new, incompatible part- *uddeśya* the previous part– *uddeśya viparābhyāṃ jeḥ* is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

4. For the ablatives used in the rule see P. 1.3.17, sub 5 and 6. For the argument regarding the augment *aṬ* see P. 1.3.17, sub 8.

5. The particle *ā* as a *karmapravacanīya* (P. 1.4.83–97) is always noted down as *āṄ*. Compare *AP* I, and P. 1.1.14, sub 4. It is used in four meanings summed up in a *kārikā* (*Mbh.* I, p. 71, lines 6–7) as follows: *īṣadarthe kriyāyoge maryādābhividhau ca yaḥ|etam ātaṃ ṅitaṃ vidyād vākyasmaraṇayor aṅitam||* 'the *ā* (*T*) which is used in the sense of *īṣat* "a little", in (the sense of) connection with a verb (that is, as a preverb), and in (the sense of)

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

maryādā " limit exclusive " and *abhividhi* " limit inclusive " one should know as provided with (the *anubandha*) *Ñ* (but) as not provided with *Ñ* when conveying the meanings *vākya* " (the sudden realisation of) a meaning " or *smaraṇa* " recollection ". '

6. As assumed by the *KV*, the effect of the *anubandha Ñ* (in the *upadeśa* form of the verbal base, *ḌUdāÑ–*) is that the *ātm.* endings will be added in the sense of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* ' the result of the action benefitting the agent ' (P. 1.3.72). Therefore the present rule must have been phrased so that *dā–* preceded by *āṄ* takes the *ātm.* endings even when the question is not of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale*. Compare P. 1.3.18, sub 6.

7. The form *das* (*daḥ*) is derived as follows :

(1) *ḌUdāÑ–*	*Dhātupāṭha* 3.9
(2) *dā*	P. 1.3.5; 1.3.3; 1.3.9
(3) *dā* + *ṄasI*	P. 4.1.2
(4) *d°* + *as*	P. 6.4.140
das.	

8. The form *daḥ* by itself is confusing, because there are several verbal bases *dā–*. Compare *AP* I, p. 26. For the verbal base *dā–* " to give " Pāṇini uses elsewhere the quotation form *dadāti*. In any case, the *ātm.* form *ādyate* (from *do- dyati*, *Dhātup.* 4.40) is not attested in prepāiṇinian literature whereas *ādatte* (from *dā– dadāti*, *Dhātup.* 3.9) is frequently attested. We therefore assume that reference is to *dā– dadāti*.

9. As regards the construction of the negation in *anāsyaviharaṇe* there are two possibilities: (1) *paryudāsa*, and (2) *prasajyapratiṣedha*, for which see *ATA*, p. 93. In *paryudāsa* the negation is construed with a noun which forms part of the negative cp., in our case, with *āsyaviharaṇa*. Accordingly, in *paryudāsa* we have an injunction containing the exclusion of a certain case. Thus the meaning *āsyaviharaṇa* is excluded from the domain in which P. 1.3.20 is to become applicable. In *prasajyapratiṣedha* the negation is construed with the verb *bhū-* which does not form part of the cp., in our case as *āsyaviharaṇe na bhavati*. Accordingly, P. 1.3.20 is taken to mean that the *ātm.* endings may be added after *ā* + *dā* generally, but not when *ā* + *dā* conveys the meaning of opening the mouth. Thus what we have here is the prohibition of an earlier injunction. In the case of negative cps in the A. the construction to be adopted is invariably that of *paryudāsa*. Kaiyaṭa on *Bh.* No. 3 on the present rule says *anāsya iti ca paryudāsaḥ* ' and the form *anāsya* is (an instance of) *paryudāsa* '.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

In our case, it makes no difference whether we adopt *paryudāsa* or *prasajyapratiṣedha*. The result is the same.

10. The example offered by the *KV* is *vidyām ādatte* 'he acquires knowledge'. The counterexample for the condition *anāsyaviharaṇe* is *āsyaṃ vyadadāti* 'he opens his mouth, he yawns'.

11. Kātyāyana has phrased two *Vts* on the present rule. *Vt.* I proposes to widen the scope of the rule by phrasing it as *āṅo do 'vyasanakriyasya* '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") after (the verbal base) *dā–* immediately preceded by (the pre-verb) *āN̐* (and) which does not signify the action of making an opening'. Patañjali provides the examples *vipādikāṃ vyādadāti* 'he opens a boil on the foot' and *kūlaṃ vyādadāti* 'he makes a breach in the bank' (*Mbh.* I, p. 279, lines 16–17). Kaiyaṭa on *Bh.* No. 1 on the present rule explains *vyasana* as *vibhāga* 'dividing' or *vikāsana* 'causing to open up'. Patañjali rejects the *Vt.* His idea is that the word *āsyaviharaṇa* in the rule is to be explained as denoting an action of the same sort as that of opening the mouth (*Mbh.* I, p. 279, lines 18–19).

Vt. II adds another exception to the one stated in the rule. It says that the *ātm.* endings are not to be used either after *dā–* preceded by *āN̐* when the object of the action of opening is a limb of one's own body. Patañjali provides the example *vyādadate pipīlikāḥ paṭaṅgamukham* 'the ants open the mouth of the grasshopper', obviously not their own mouth.

1.3.21 (a) KRĪḌAḤ '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") after (the verbal base) *krīḍ–* "to play" (immediately preceded by the preverb *āN̐*)'

1. The rule translated here is not P. 1.3.21 in its traditional wording. We propose to divide the rule into two, as follows :

P. 1.3.21 (a) *krīḍaḥ*

P. 1.3.21 (b) *anusaṃparibhyaś ca*

The reasons for doing so are two. First, the word *ca* should not come after the second word in a *sūtra*. In the A., like in daily speech, the particle *ca* as a sentence–connective is always placed after the first word of the second sentence or rule, see Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 232. Secondly, the only function which can be reasonably assigned to *ca* in the present context is that of boundary marker. Thereby *anusaṃparibhyaḥ* is marked off as a separate rule. Compare Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 36, 232.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Originally, the text of the A. was committed to memory and orally transmitted in continuous recitation (*saṃhitāpāṭha*). Compare Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 232. Therefore *sandhi* was applied. Consequently, *krīḍaḥ anusaṃparibhyaś ca* became *krīḍo 'nusaṃparibhyaś ca*.

2. The function assigned to *ca* in P. 1.3.21 by the *KV* is to ensure the continuation of *āṅaḥ* from P. 1.3.20. Thus, as far as the result – the continuation of *āṅaḥ* – is concerned, there is no difference between the traditional interpretation of P. 1.3.21 and the proposal of two separate rules stated above.

3. P. 1.3.21 (a) is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

4. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

5. The *uddeśya* is *āṅaḥ* (*dhātoḥ*) *krīḍaḥ*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible part– *uddeśya*, namely, *krīḍaḥ*, the previous part– *uddeśya daḥ* is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

The meaning-condition *anāsyaviharaṇe* from P. 1.3.20 is discontinued on the basis of *sāmarthya*. The point is that *ā* + *krīḍ*– does not convey that meaning.

6. The example offered by the *KV* is *ākrīḍate* 'he plays much' (*ā=samantāt*).

1.3.21 (b) ANUSAṂPARIBHYAŚ CA 'also (the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after the verbal base *krīḍ*–) immediately preceded by (the preverbs) *anu, sam* or *pari*'

1. For the proposed division of the traditional rule see P. 1.3.21 (a), sub 1.

2. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

3. *Ca*, being a multi-purpose word in the A., has two functions in the present rule. First, it marks off this rule from P. 1.3.21 (a). Secondly, it connects the present rule with the topic indicated by the previous rule, namely, the addition of the *ātm.* endings after *krīḍ*–.

4. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

5. The *uddeśya* is *anusaṃparibhyaḥ* (*dhātoḥ krīḍaḥ*). The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam*). The word *krīḍaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.21 (a), since there is nothing to block it. The word *āṅaḥ* from P. 1.3.21 (a) is discontinued by the new, incompatible part–*uddeśya anusaṃparibhyaḥ*. Compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

6. The examples offered by the *KV* on P. 1.3.21 are *anukrīḍate* 'he plays like', *saṃkrīḍate* ' 'he plays well' and *parikrīḍate* 'he plays again'.

The *KV* notes that because here *anu*, etc. are mentioned together with *sam*, the *upasargas* 'préverbs' *anu*, etc. are meant, not the *karmapravacanīyas* 'pre/postpositions' *anu*, etc. The counterexample is *māṇavakam anu krīḍati* 'he plays with the boy'. The idea stems from Patañjali. So also the example in a slightly different wording, *anu krīḍati māṇavakam* (*Mbh*. I, p. 280, line 2). Reference for *anu* as a *karmapravacanīya* is to P. 1.4.85.

7. Kātyāyana has phrased 8 *Vts* on P. 1.3.21. *Vt*. I says that the *ātm*. endings are added to *krīḍ*– immediately preceded by *sam*, except in the sense of *kūjana* 'creaking'. Patañjali provides the example *saṃkrīḍanti śakaṭāni* 'the carts creak' (*Mbh*. I, p. 280, line 4).

Vt. II says that the *ātm*. endings are added after *ā* + *gami*. The form *gami* is used in P. 1.3.29 as the quotation from of the verbal base *gam*–, by *Vt*. II on P. 3.3.108. The present *Vt*. contains no clue indicating that the causative base of *gam*– is meant. But the example provided by Patañjali is of the causative. It saya *āgamayasva tāvan māṇavaka* 'well then, have patience, boy!' (*Mbh*. I, p. 280, line 6).

Vt. III saye that the *ātm*. endings are added after the verbal base *śikṣ*– (quoted as *śikṣi* by *Vt*. II on P. 3.3.108) in the sense of desiring to know. Patañjali provides the examples *vidyāsu śikṣate* 'he desires to have training in the sciences', and *dhanuṣi śikṣate* 'he desires to have training in bow–lore' (*Mbh*. I, p. 280, line 8). Normally, the *ātm*. endings are not added after *śikṣ*– in the sense of 'to learn'. By what rule the locative ending is added in the examples is not clear. We note that the base *śikṣ*– itself is orlginally a desiderative formation, and that is has been prescribed by *Vt*. III in a desiderative sense.

Vt. IV says that the *ātm*. endings are added after *kṝī*– in the sense of 'excitement, finding food, or making a nest'. Patañjali provides the examples *apaskirate vṛṣabho hṛṣṭaḥ* 'the excited bull scrapes the earth', *apaskirate kukkuṭo bhakṣārthī* 'the cock scrapes the earth in search of food', and

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

apaskirate śvāśrayārthī 'the dog scrapes the earth looking for shelter' (*Mbh.* I, p. 280, lines 10–11).

Vt. V says that the *ātm.* endings are added after *hṛ–* in the sense of *gatatācchīlya* 'the nature of a manner'. Patañjali provides the examples *paitṛkam aśvā anuharante* 'horses take the nature of their father', and *mātṛkaṃ gāvo 'nuharante* 'cows take the nature of their mother' (*Mbh.* I, p. 280 lines 13–14). The *Vt.* makes no mention of the preverb *anu.* Instead of *gata–* (P. 3.3.114), the reading *gati–* is also known to the *KV.* The *Padamañjarī* on the *KV* here glosses *gati* as *prakāra* 'manner'.

Vt. VI says that the *ātm.* endings are added after *nu–* 'to make a sound' and *pracch–* 'to ask' when preceded by *ā*Ṅ. Patañjali provides the examples *ānute sṛgālaḥ* 'the jackal howls', and *āpṛcchate gurum* 'he bids farewell to his teacher' (*Mbh.* I, p. 280, line 16).

Vt. VII says that the *ātm.* endings are added after *nāth–* in the sense of uttering a wish. Patañjali provides the examples *sarpiṣo nāthate* 'he utters a wish for clarified butter', and *madhuno nāthate* 'he utters a wish for honey'. (*Mbh.* I, p. 280, line 18). The genitive ending is added by P. 2.3.55.

Vt. VIII says that the *atm.* endings are added after *śap–* in the sense of *upalambhana.* According to the *KV* here, *upalambhana* means *vācā śarīra–sparśanam* 'touching (someone's) body while making a statement'. An illustration of what is meant is provided by the *Padamañjarī* on the *KV* here, namely, *tvatpādau spṛśāmi naitan mayā kṛtam* 'I touch your feet, I didn't do it'. According to the *Nyāsa* here, what is meant is a kind of oath. Patañjali provides the examples *devadattāya śapate* 'he swears to Devadatta', and *yajñadattāya śapate* 'he swears to Yajñadatta' (*Mbh.* I, p. 280, line 20). The dative ending is used by P. 1.4.34.

1.3.22 SAMAVAPRAVIBHYAḤ STHAḤ '(The *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") immediately after (the verbal base) *sthā–* "to stand" immediately preceded by (the preverbs) *sam, ava, pra* or *vi*'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra.* See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The present rule opens a section which deals with the verbal base *sthā–* and which ends with P. 1.3.26.

3. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

4. The *uddeśya* is *samavapravibhyaḥ* (*dhātoḥ*) *sthaḥ*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* the previous *uddeśya* is automatically discontinued. See Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

5. For the ablatives used in the rule see P. 1.3.17, sub 5 and 6. For the derivation of the form *sthaḥ* compare that of *daḥ*, P. 1.3.20, sub 7.

6. The examples offered by the *KV* are *saṃtiṣṭhate* 'he stays with', *avatiṣṭhate* 'he waits patiently', *pratiṣṭhate* 'he sets out' and *vitiṣṭhate* 'he stands apart'.

7. Kātyāyana, in *Vt.* I on the present rule, proposes an addition saying that the *ātm.* endings are added after *sthā-* immediately preceded by the preverb *aN* in the sense of *pratijñāna* 'proposal'. The examples provided by Patañjali are *astiṃ sakāram ātiṣṭhate* 'he proposes that (the verbal base) *as-* consists in *s*', *āgamau guṇavṛddhī ātiṣṭhate* 'he proposes that the augments (*aṬ* and *āṬ*) consist in *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*', and *vikāṛau guṇavṛddhī ātiṣṭhate* 'he proposes that the modifications consist in *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*' (*Mbh.* I, p. 280, lines 23–24).

According to the *Nyāsa* on the *KV* here, the opinions recorded are those of Āpiśali. As explained by Nāgeśa on *Bh.* No. 1 on the present rule, the idea is that the original form to be assumed for the pāṇinian verbal base *as-* should be *s*. Then, to derive the forms like $a + s + ti$ and $\bar{a} + s + \bar{i} + t$ the augments *aṬ* and *āṬ* are added respectively. These augments are, in fact, the *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* forms of the vowel *a*. Or, alternatively, to derive the same forms, it may be assumed that *as* and *ās* are modifications, that is, substitutes of the original base *s*.

We note that the usages quoted by Patañjali are examples of grammatical usage rather than of ordinary language.

1.3.23 PRAKĀŚANASTHEYĀKHYAYOŚ CA 'also (the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after the verbal base *sthā-* "to stand") in the sense of *prakāśana* "disclosing one's intention" or *stheyākhyā* "resorting to an arbitrator"'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. *Ca*, being a multi-purpose word in the A. has two functions in the present rule. First, it marks off this rule from P. 1.3.22 which otherwise would

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

have read *samavapravibhyaḥ sthaḥ prakāśanastheyākhyayoḥ*. Secondly, it connects the present rule with the topic of the previous rule, namely, the addition of the *ātm.* endings after *sthā-*. Compare P. 1.3.16, sub 2, and P. 1.3.21 (b), sub 3.

3. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *sthaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.22.

4. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ sthaḥ*) *prakāśanastheyākhyayoḥ*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). The word *samavapravibhyaḥ* from P. 1.3.22 is discontinued on the basis of *sāmarthya*. That is to say, its continuation in P. 1.2.23 doesn't make sense.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *prakāśanastheyākhyayoḥ* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 4.

Since it is assumed that the meanings stated form part of the *uddeśya*, one may wonder, what is the function of the *ātm.* endings in bringing out these meanings ? The idea is that it is precisely the function of these endings to bring out the meanings stated which inhere in the verbal base. The *ātm.* endings are therefore *dyotaka* 'revealer', not *vācaka* 'expressing (a sense of their own)'.

5. The *KV* glosses the word *prakāśana* as *svābhiprāyakathanam* 'disclosing one's intention' and analyses the word *stheyākhyā* as *stheyasya ākhyā* 'resorting to an arbitrator'. The word *stheya* is derived in the sense of *tiṣṭhanty asmin* 'they abide by him'. As explained by the *Nyāsa*, in the formal derivation of *stheya* the rules P. 3.1.97, P. 6.4.65 and P. 7.3.84 are successively applied. The *KV* explains the word *ākhyā* as having the meaning of *pratipatti* 'resorting to'.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

7. The examples offered by the *KV* are *tiṣṭhate kanyā chātrebhyaḥ* 'the girl discloses her intention to the students'. The dative ending is used by P. 1.4.34; *tiṣṭhate vṛṣalī grāmaputrebhyaḥ* 'the out-caste woman makes her intentions known to the village boys'; *tvayi tiṣṭhate* 'he resorts to you as an arbitrator'; *mayi tiṣṭhate* 'he resorts to me as an arbitrator'; and *saṃśayya karṇādiṣu tiṣṭhate yaḥ* '(he) who having entertained doubt resorts to Karṇa, etc. as an arbitrator'. The last example is a part – quotation of *Kirātārjunīya* 3.14. The *Nyāsa* quotes the stanza in full.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.3.24 UDO 'NŪRDHVAKARMAṆI '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after the verbal base *sthā*– "to stand") immediately preceded by (the preverb) *ud*, except in the sense of an action of moving upwards'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *sthaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.22.

3. The *uddeśya* is *udaḥ* (*dhātoḥ sthaḥ*) *anūrdhvakarmaṇi*. Compare P. 1.3.23, sub 4. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible part– *uddeśya* the previous part– *uddeśya samavapravibhyaḥ* is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi– Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning–condition *anūrdhvakarmaṇi* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

4. For the construction of the negation in *anūrdhvakarmaṇi* see P. 1.3.20, sub 9.

5. For the ablative *udaḥ* see P. 1.3.17, sub 5.

6. The *KV* explains that the word *karman* in the rule means *kriyā* and provides the examples *gehe uttiṣṭhate* 'he exerts himself for the house' and *kuṭumbe uttiṣṭhate* 'he exerts himself for the family'. The counterexample for the condition *anūrdhvakarmaṇi* is *āsanād uttiṣṭhati* 'he rises from the seat'.

7. Kātyāyana in *Vt.* I on the present rule, replaces the condition *anūrdhvakarmṇi* by *īhāyām* 'in the sense of *īhā*'. Kaiyaṭa on *Bh.* No. 1 on P. 1.3.24 explains *īhā* as *viśiṣṭā ceṣṭā kāyaparispandanātmikā* 'a particular activity consisting in a stirring of the body'. The counterexample provided by Patañjali is *uttiṣṭhati senā* 'the army is being collected' (*Mbh.* I, p. 281, line 3 Kaiyaṭa on *Bh.* No. 1 on P. 1.3.24).

1.3.25 UPĀN MANTRAKARAṆE '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after the verbal base *sthā*– "to stand") immediately preceded by (the preverb) *upa* in the sense of (an activity) in which a *mantra* is (used as) the means'

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *sthaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.22.

3. The *uddeśya* is *upāt* (*dhātoḥ sthaḥ*) *mantrakaraṇe*. Compare P. 1.2.23, sub 4. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible part—*uddeśya* the previous part—*uddeśya udaḥ* is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *mantrakaraṇe* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1 3.14, sub 3.

4. The *Nyāsa* on the *KV* here explains the word *mantrakaraṇa* as *mantraḥ karaṇaṃ sādhakatamaṃ yasya dhātvarthasya saḥ* 'that verb meaning of which a mantra is the most effective means' with a clear reference to P. 1.4.42. In the translation adopted above the word *mantrakaraṇa* is accepted as a *bv*. cp. The word *karaṇa* is taken in its *laukika* sense of 'means' of of which of course, the grammatical equivalent is the most effective means.

5. The *KV* offers the examples *aindryā gārhapatyam upatiṣṭhate* 'he worships the *gārhapatya* fire with a hymn devoted to Indra', and *āgneyyāgnīdhram upatiṣṭhate* 'he worships the sacrificial fire place with a hymn devoted to Agni'. The counterexample for the meaning-condition *mantrakaraṇe* is *bhartāram upatiṣṭhati yauvanena* 'she approaches her husband on account of her youth'.

6, Kātyāyana has phrased two *Vts* on the present rule. *Vt*. I proposes to to rephrase the rule as *upād devapūjāsaṃgatakaraṇayoḥ* '(the *ātm*. endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after the verbal base *sthā*– "to stand") immediately preceded by *upa* in the sense of worshipping a deity or entering into close relations with.' Patañjali provides the examples *ādityam upatiṣṭhate* 'he worships the sun', *rathikān upatiṣṭhate* 'he enters into close relations with charioteers', and *aśvārohān upatiṣṭhate* 'he enters into close relations with horsemen' (*Mbh*. I, p. 281, lines 6–7).

7. Patañjali in his *bhāsya* on *Vt*. I quotes two verses to explain the difference between *arkam upatiṣṭhate* and *arkam upatiṣṭhati*. The verses read as follows: *bahūnām apy acittānām eko bhavati cittavān|paśya vānarasainye 'smin yad arkam upatiṣṭhate||maivaṃ maṃsthāḥ sacitto 'yam eṣo 'pi yathā vayam | etad apy asya kāpeyam yad arkam upatiṣṭhati* 'look, even among many who lack reason there is one who is endowed with reason in this army of

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

monkeys because he worships the sun. Don't think that he is endowed with reason, he also is like us. This also is (part of) his monkey-nature that he basks in the sun'.

8. Patañjali mentions the opinion of another grammarian regarding the phrasing of the rule. According to this grammarian, the rule should read *upād devapūjāsaṃgatakaraṇamitrakaraṇapathiṣu* '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after the verbal base *sthā-* "to stand") immediately preceded by *upa* in the sense of worshipping a deity, entering into close relations, forming friendship and (the direction of) a road'. The examples for the last two meanings provided by Patañjali are *rathikān upatiṣṭhate* 'he forms friendship with charioteers', *aśvārohān upatiṣṭhate* 'he forms friendsh with the horsemen', *ayaṃ panthāḥ srughnam upatiṣṭhate* 'this road leads to Srughna', and *ayaṃ panthāḥ sāketam upatiṣṭhate* 'this road leads to Sāketa *Mbh.* I, p. 281, lines 13–14).

The example for *mitrakaraṇa* quoted by the *KV* is *mahāmātrān upatiṣṭhate* 'he forms friendship with the elephant-drivers'. The *KV* then wonders, what is the difference between *mitrakaraṇa* and *saṃgata-* (or *saṃgati-*)*karaṇa*? The answer is that in *samgatakaraṇa* we have *upaśleṣa* 'close (physical) contact', as in *gaṅgā yamunām upatiṣṭhate* 'the Gaṅgā joins with the Yamunā', whereas friendship may be established even without *upaśleṣa*.

9. *Vt.* II states an addition to P. 1.3.25. It says that the *ātm.* endings are optionally (*vā*) added after *sthā-* preceded by *upa* in the sense of wanting to obtain. Patañjali provides the examples *bhikṣuko brāhmaṇakulam upatiṣṭhati* or *upatiṣṭhate* 'the mendicant goes to the brahmin's house with the desire to obtain (alms)' (*Mbh.* I, p. 281, lines 16–17).

10. We note that the meanings assigned to *upa* + *sthā-* while taking the *ātm.* endings are meanings dependent on the context.

1.3.26 AKARMAKĀC CA 'also (the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after the verbal base *sthā-* "to stand" immediately preceded by the preverb *upa*) when used intransitively'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1,

2. To the word *ca* in the present rule two functions may be assigned. First, it marks off P. 1.3.26 from the previous rule which otherwise would have read *upān mantrakaraṇe 'karmakāt*. Secondly, it connects P. 1.3.26 with the

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

topic of the previous rule, namely, the addition of the *ātm.* endings after *sthā–* preceded by *upa.* Compare P. 1.3.16, sub 2; P. 1.3.21 (b), sub 3 and P. 1.2.23, sub 2.

3. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *sthaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.22. The word *upāt* is continued from P. 1.3.25.

4. The *uddeśya* is (*upāt dhātoḥ sthaḥ*) *akarmakāt.* The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). The word *mantrakaraṇe* from P. 1.3.25 is discontinued on the basis of *sāmarthya.* That is to say, the continuation of the condition *mantrakaraṇe* wouldn't make sense in the present rule.

The word *akarmakāt* is obviously to be connected with *sthaḥ.* Therefore it can only be part of the *uddeśya.*

The mention of *akarmakāt* in the present rule implies that P. 1.3.25 deals with the transitive use of *sthā–* preceded by *upa.*

5. For what is meant by *akarmaka* see *KARA*, p. 255–60.

The *SK*, No. 2701, on P. 7.1.7, mentions a *kārikā* which briefly analyses the notion *akarmaka.* It says *dhātor arthāntare vṛtter dhātvarthenopa–saṃgrahāt/ prasiddher avivakṣātaḥ karmaṇo 'karmikā kriyā* 'an action becomes object–less on account of the use of a verbal base in a different meaning, on account of (the grammatical object) being included in the meaning of the verbal base, because (the object) is wellknown (and) because (the speaker) has no desire to express the object'. The examples are successively :

(a) *vahati bhāram*, contrasted with *nadī vahati.* In *nadī vahati* the verbal base *vah–* conveys the different meaning of *syandana* 'flowing';

(b) *jīvati* 'he lives' or *nṛtyati* 'he dances'. The meanings of *jiv–* and *nṛt–* can be described as *prāṇadhāraṇa* 'the maintainance of life' and *aṅgavikṣepa* 'movement of the limbs' respectively. Here the object is included in the verbal base meaning.

(c) *megho varṣati* 'the cloud rains'. Here the object *jalam* 'water' is wellknown, so it need not be mentioned.

(d) *hitān na yaḥ saṃśṛṇute sa kiṃprabhuḥ* 'he is a bad ruler who does not listen (to advice coming) from a well–meaning person'. Here for some reason or other the speaker didn't want to express the object 'advice'.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

7. The example offered by the *KV* is *yāvadbhuktam upatiṣṭhate*. Here *bhukta* is explained as a *Kta*–derivation in the sense of *bhāva* 'impersonal action', by P. 3.3.114. Thus *bhukta* is taken to mean *bhojana* 'eating', or 'meal'. The expression as whole is explained as *bhojane bhojane sannidhīyate* 'he is near at each and every meal'.

As stated by the *Nyāsa* here, *yāvat* is a *nipāta* which forms an *avyayībhāva* cp. in the sense of *yathā*. One of the senses of *yathā* is *vipsā* 'intention to cover all cases' (see *ATA, Bh.* No. 4 on P. 2.1.7; *KV* on P. 2.1.6).

The cp. *yāvadbhuktam* may be derived by P. 2.1.8 also. In that case, *yāvadbhuktam* means 'as long as there is food'. Accordingly, *yāvadbhuktam upatiṣṭhate* means 'he is near as long as there is food'.

The counterexample for the condition *akarmakāt* offered by the *KV* is *rājānam upatiṣṭhati* 'he waits upon the king'.

1.3.27 UDVIBHYĀṂ TAPAḤ '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") immediately after (the verbal base) *tap*– "to produce heat" immediately preceded by (the preverbs) *ud* or *vi* (when used intransitively)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P.1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

The *KV* expressly says that the word *akarmakāt* is continued from P. 1.3.26 and offers examples of intransitive usage only. But the question may be asked, how are we to know at all that the word *akarmakāt* is continued in P. 1.3.27?

There are two more rules *akarmakāc ca*, both of them in the same *pāda*. The first is P. 1.3.35. It deals with a particular use of *kṛ*– preceded by *vi*. The next rule, P. 1.3.36, introduces a completely new *uddeśya*. In this rule the word *akarmakāt* is not continued. The second is P. 1.3.45. It deals with a particular use of *jñā*–. The next rule, P. 1.3.46, continues the topic of *jñā*–, but the word *akarmakāt* is not continued. Then why should *akarmakāt* be continued in P.1.3.27 without any indication to this effect? In fact, to indicate that the word *akarmakāt* is to be continued in P. 1.3.27, the *sūtrakāra* should have used the word *ca*. Sincd he did not do so, the continuation of the word *akarmakāt* in P. 1.3.27 is anomalous.

Then again, supposing that the *sūtrakāra* would have used the word *ca* in P. 1.3.27 for the purpose stated, where to put this word? There are just

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

two possibilities. He could have phrased the rule as *udvibhyāṃ ca tapaḥ* or as *udvibhyāṃ tapaś ca*. In both cases the rule is open to serious misunderstanding. Thus, maybe, the *sūtrakāra* opted for the lesser evil, leaving the word *ca* out altogether. But then it may be asked, why didn't he state the word *akarmakāt* in the rule ?

3. The *uddeśya* is *udvibhyāṃ* (*dhātoḥ*) *tapaḥ* (*akarmakāt*). The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible part—*uddeśya* the previous part—*uddeśya upāt sthaḥ* is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

The word *akarmakāt* is obviously to be connected with *tapaḥ*. Therefore it can only be part of the *uddeśya*.

4. For the ablatives in the rule see P. 1.3.17, sub 5 and 6. We note that in *udvibhyām* the du. abl. ending *-bhyām* is used, and not the older ending *-os*. Compare P. 1.3.10, sub 5 and P. 3.2.5.

5. The examples offered by the *KV* are *uttapate* ' (the sun) shines *vitapate* ' (the sun) shines '. The counterexamples for the condition *akarmakāt* are *uttapati suvarṇam suvarṇakāraḥ* ' the goldsmith heats up the gold ' taken from Patañjali (*Mbh*. I, p. 281, line 19) and *vitapati pṛṣṭhaṃ savitā* ' the sun warms the back ', for which see under 6.

6. Kātyāyana, in *Vt*. I on the present rule, adds that the *ātm*. endings are also added after *tap–* when the object of the action is a limb of one's own body. Patañjali provides the examples *uttapate pāṇī* ' he warms his hands ', *vitapate pāṇī* ' he warms his hands '. *uttapate pṛṣṭham* ' he warms his back ' and *vitapate pṛṣṭham* ' he warms his back '. For *svāṅga* ' a limb of one's own body ' compare *Vt*. II on P. 1.3.20.

7. In his discussion on *Vt*. I Patañjali raises the question of a counterexample for the preverbs *ud* or *vi*. The counterexample provided is *niṣṭapyate* ' it produces heat (of its own) ' (*Mbh*. I, p. 281, line 23). But why a counterexample showing an *ātm*. ending, and not one showing a *parasmaipada* ending ? The answer involves a number of logical steps. First, *tap–* as prescribed by P. 1.3.27 is an intransitive verb. Secondly, *niṣṭap–*, which shows the *upasarga nis*, is a transitive verb. Thirdly, transitive verbs provided with an *upasarga* can only become intransitive in the agent treated like object–construction (*karmakartṛ*, P. 3.1.87). In the fourth place, to derive a *karmakartṛ* form, we use *yaK*, by P. 3.1.67. In the fifth place, if *yaK* is used, the *ātm*. endings are added by P. 1.3.13. That is why.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Subsequently, it is denied that transitive verbs can only become intransitive in the *karmakartṛ* use. They can also become intransitive outside the *karmakartṛ* use. The example is *nadī vahati* 'the river flows' (*Mbh.* I P. 282, line 4). Here a normally transitive verb (compare *bhāraṃ vahati* 'he carries a load') is used intransitively without involving the *karmakartṛ* use.

For *nadī vahati* compare P. 1.3.26, sub 5. Actually, what Patañjali does in his *bhāṣya* on *Vt.* I on P. 1.3.27 is that he adds one more instance of *akarmaka* use to the ones enumerated in the *kārikā* mentioned under P. 1.3.26. sub 5. The instance added is that of the *karmakartṛ*, where the original *karman* 'object' becomes *kartṛ* 'agent'.

1.3.28 ĀṄO YAMAHANAḤ '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") immediately after (the verbal bases) *yam*– "to restrain" or *han*– "to strike" immediately preceded by (the preverb) *āṄ* (when used intransitively)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra.* See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after the verbal bases' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3

The *KV* expressly says that the word *akarmakāt* is continued from P. 1.3.26 and offers examples of intransitive usages only, See further P. 1.3.27, sub 2.

3. The *uddeśya* is *āṅaḥ* (*dhātoḥ*) *yamahanaḥ* (*akarmakāt*). The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible part–*uddeśya* the previous part–*uddeśya udvibhyāṃ tapaḥ* is automatically discontinued. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

The word *akarmakāt* is obviously to be connected with *yamahanaḥ*. Therefore it can only be part of the *uddeśya*.

4. For the ablatives in the rule see P. 1.3.17, sub 5 and 6. We note that *yamahanaḥ* is a sg. abl. instead of the du. abl. expected. The form must therefore be explained as a *samāhāradvandva* of items disjunctively connected.

5. The *KV*, having noted that *yam*– (*Dhātup.* 1.1033) and *han*– (*Dhātup.* 2.2) are both *udāttet*, and therefore normally take the *parasmaipada* endings, provides examples for the 3rd person sg., du. and pl. whereas usually examples of the 3rd sg. only are given. The examples are *āyacchate* 'he stretches *āyacchete* 'they both stretch' and *āyacchante* 'they (pl.) stretch'; and *āhate* 'he strikes', *āghnāte* 'they both strike' and *āghnate* 'they (pl.) strike'. The

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

counterexamples for the condition *akarmakāt* are *āyacchati kūpād rajjum* 'he pulls the rope back from the well', *āhanti vṛṣalaṃ pādena* 'he kicks the outcaste'. Both counterexamples are taken from Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 282, line 7)

6. Kātyāyana, in *Vt.* I on the present rule, states an addition. The *ātm.* endings are also added after *yam–*, and *han–* preceded by *āN̐*, when the object of the action is a limb of one's own body. Patañjali provides the examples *āyacchate pāṇī* 'he stretches out his hands' and *āhata udaram* 'he strikes his belly'. For *svāṅga* 'a limb of one's own body' compare *Vt.* II on P. 1.3.20 and *Vt.* I on P. 1.3.27.

A counterexample for the *Vt.* is provided by the *KV* as *āhanti śiraḥ parakīyam* 'he strikes the head of someone else'.

7. As regards the derivation of *āyacchate* we note the substitution of *ch* for the *m* of *yam–*, by P. 7.3.77, the addition of *t* (before the *ch*), by P. 6.1.73, and the substitution of *c* for the *t* by P. 8.4.40.

As regards the derivation of *āhate* we note the deletion of the final *n* (of *han*) by P. 6.4.37. In *āghnate* the *a* (of *han*) is deleted by P. 6.4.98, whereas the initial *h* is replaced by *gh* by P. 7.3.54.

1.3.29 SAMO GAMYṚCCHIBHYĀṂ '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") immediately after (the verbal bases) *gam–* "to go" or *ṛcch–* "to reach" immediately preceded by (the preverb) *sam* (when used intransitively)'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The *KV* reads the rule as *samo gamyṛcchipracchisvaratyartiśruvidibhyaḥ* by inserting verbal bases mentioned in the *Vts* I and II on the present rule into the rule itself. The *Mbh.* reads the rule as stated.

3. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* (=*dhātubhyām* 'after the two verbal bases', with the required change of number) see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

The *KV* expressly says that the word *akarmakāt* is continued from P. 1.3.26 and offers examples of intransitive usages only. See further P. 1.3.27, sub 2.

4. The *uddeśya* is *samaḥ* (*dhātubhyāṃ*) *gamyṛcchibhyām* (*akarmakāt*). The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible part –*uddeśya* the previous part–*uddeśya āṅo yamahanaḥ* is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi-Bhate 1984, P. 271, convention 4.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

5. The forms *gami* and *ṛcchi* are quotation forms of the bases *gam-* and *ṛcch-* by Vt. II on p. 3.3.108. For *gami* compare P. 1.3.21 (b), sub 7, on *Vt.* II.

6. For the ablatives in the rule see P. 1.3.17, sub 5 and 6. We note that in *gamyṛcchibhyām* the du. abl. ending *-bhyām* is used, and not the older ending -os, for which see P. 1.3.10, sub 4. Nor has the sg. abl. ending been used, as in P. 1.3.28.

7. The *KV* provides the examples *saṃgacchate* 'goes together with', *saṃpṛcchate* 'he inquires', *saṃsvarate* 'sounds together with' and *samkalpā asya samaranta* 'his resolves have come about'.

The *KV* explains that *samaranta* is an aor. form in which *aṄ* is substituted for *cli*, by P. 3.1.56, where *guṇa* is applied to the verbal base vowel, and the augment *āṬ* has not been applied in spite of the fact that the prohibitive particle *mā* is not used, by P. 6.4.75, a Vedic rule.

Two more examples are *saṃśṛṇute* 'he hears' and *saṃvitte* 'he is aware', both borrowed from Patañjali.

The *KV* explains that by the base quoted as *arti* the verbal base *ṛcch–* (*Dhātup.* 6.15) is meant, and not the base *ṛ–* which is replaced by *ṛcch–*, by P. 7.3.78. As a matter of fact, we have two bases *ṛ–*, one recorded in the *Dhātup.* 1.983, the other in the *Dhātup.* 3.15–16. The point is that from the original base *ṛcch–* the future *samṛcchiṣyate* 'he will meet' can be derived, whereas from the replacement base *ṛcch–* we cannot derive this form, because P. 7.3.78 is conditioned by the word *śiti*, as explained by the *Nyāsa* here. *Śiti* restricts the choice of suffixes to *sārvadhātuka* suffixes. Since the future forming suffix *sya* (P. 3.1.33) is *ārdhadhātuka*, replacement will not take place, and the future form we derive in this case is *ariṣyati*, with *iṭāgama* by P. 7.2.20.

Finally the *KV* explains that by the base *vidi* in the rule the verbal base *vid–* 'to know' is meant (and not *vid–* 'to find'), because in the rule the base *vidi* is mentioned together with *gam–*, etc. which all of them take *parasmaipada* endings only. The point is that *vid–* stated in the sense of *lābha* 'obtaining' (*Dhātup.* 6.138) is *svaritet*, and thus may take *ātm.* endings also. For the argument see *PN*, *pb.* 103.

8. Kātyāyana has phrased three *Vts* on the present rule. *Vt.* I proposes to add the verbal bases *vid–* 'to know', *pracch–* 'to ask' and *svṛ–* 'to utter a sound'. Patañjali provides the examples *saṃvitte* 'he is aware', *saṃpṛcchate*

AṢṬ...8

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

'he inquires' and *saṃsvarate* 'sounds together with' (*Mbh.* I, p. 282, lines 12–13).

Vt. II proposes another addition, namely, of the bases *ṛ*– 'to move', *śru*– 'to hear' and *dṛś*– 'to see'. Patañjali provides the examples *mā samṛta* 'don't let him meet', *mā samṛṣātām* 'don't let the two of them meet' and *mā samṛṣata* 'don't let them (pl.) meet for the base *ṛ*–. For *śru*– he mentions *saṃśṛṇute* 'he listens to', and for *dṛś*– we have *saṃpaśyate* 'he sees' (*Mbh.* I, p. 282, lines 15–16).

In *samṛta* the *s* (of *sIC* replacing *cli*, P. 3.1.44) is deleted by P. 1.2.12 before an ending which begins with a *jhaL*–letter.

The *KV* mentions this *Vt.* as *dṛśeś ceti vaktavyam* and quotes the usage *grāmaṃ saṃpaśyati* 'he sees the village' as a counterexample for the condition *akarmakāt* in connection with *dṛś*–.

Vt. III phrases an option (*vāvacanam*) for *as*– 'to throw' and *ūh*– 'to guess' immediately preceded by a preverb. Patañjali provides the examples *nirasyati* or *nirasyate* 'he rejects' and *samūhati* or *samūhate* 'he guesses' (*Mbh.* I, p. 282, line 18).

The *KV* mentions this *Vt.* as a *Vt.* on P. 1.3.30.

1.3.30 NISAMUPAVIBHYO HVAḤ '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* 'agent') immediately after (the verbal base) *hvā*– 'to call' immediately preceded by (the preverbs) *ni*, *sam*, *upa* or *vi*'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

The *KV* expressly says that the word *akarmakāt* from P. 1.3.26 is discontinued.

3. The *uddeśya* is *nisamupavibhyo* (*dhātoḥ*) *hvaḥ*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible part– *uddeśya* the previous part– *uddeśya samo gamyṛcchibhyām* is automatically discontinued. Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

4. For the ablatives in the rule see P. 1.3.17, sub 5 and 6. For the derivation of the form *hvaḥ* (from *hvā*–) compare that of *daḥ*, P. 1.3.20, sub 7. The genitive form *hvaḥ* is used in P. 6.1.32.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

5. The verbal base quoted as *hvā–* in the rule has been mentioned in the *Dhātup.* (1.1057) as *hveÑ–*. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, 1889, para. 761, f., says that verbal bases reckoned as ending in *e* and belonging to the *bhuvādī* class are best regarded as bases in *ā*. According to Whitney, ibid., *hve–* is a secondary base, derived from *hū–*, See further G. B. Palsule, *The Sanskrit Dhātupāṭhas*, Poona 1961, p. 177.

6. As explained by the *KV*, the base *hveÑ* is *Ñit* and therefore takes the *ātm.* endings in the sense of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* ' the result of the action benefitting the agent ', by P. 1.3.72. The separate phrasing of the present rule must therefore be taken to imply that the *ātm.* endings are invariably added to *hve/hvā–* when preceded by the preverbs mentioned.

7. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

8. The examples provided by the *KV* are *nihvayate* ' he invokes ', *saṃhvayate* ' he calls out ', *upahvayate* ' he invokes ' and *vihvayate* 'he invokes '.

1.3.31 SPARDDHĀYĀM ĀṄAḤ '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* ' agent ' immediately after the verbal base *hvā–* ' to call ') immediately preceded by (the pre–verb *āṄ*, in the sense of *sparddhā* " competition ".

1. This is a *vidhisūtra.* See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepādam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. The word *hvaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.30. For the word *dhātoḥ* ' after a verbal base ' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *āṅaḥ* (*dhātoḥ hvaḥ*) *sparddhāyām.* The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible part–*uddeśya* the previous part–*uddeśya nisamupavibhyaḥ* is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning–condition *sparddhāyām* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

4. For the meaning of the ablative *āṅaḥ* see P. 1.3.17, sub 5.

5. The *KV* explains that the separate phrasing of the present rule must be taken to imply that the *ātm.* endings are invariably added to *hve/hvā–* when preceded by *āṄ* and conveying the sense indicated. See further P. 1.3.30 sub 6.

6. The *KV* explains that the word *sparddhā* means *saṃgharṣa* ' rivalry ', that is, the desire to win, although the verbal base meaning is that of uttering sound, in fact, of calling.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The *SK*, No. 2232, on P. 8.4.18, quotes a stanza which says *upasargeṇa dhātvartho balād anyatra nīyate|prahārāhārasaṃhāravihārapratihāravat* 'on account of the preverb the verbal base necessarily assumes a different meaning, like in *hṛ*– when preceded by *pra*, *a*, *sam*, *vi*, or *prati*.' For the *dyotaka*-view in connection with *ātm.* endings compare P. 1.2.23, sub 4.

7. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

8. The examples provided by the *KV* are *mallo mallam āhvayate* 'a wrestler challenges (another) wrestler' and *chātraś chātram āhvayate* 'a student challenges (another) student'.

Usually the examples quoted by the *KV* are put in the 3rd sg. present tense. But it goes without saying that the *ātm.* endings are added in all persons, tenses and moods.

The counterexample for the meaning *sparddhā* is *gām āhvayati gopālaḥ* 'the cowherd calls the cow'.

1.3.32 GANDHANĀVAKṢEPAṆASEVANASĀHASIKYAPRATIYATNA-PRAKATHANOPAYOGEṢU KṚÑAḤ '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* 'agent' immediately after the verbal base) *kṛÑ*– "to make" in the sense of (1) *gandhana* disparagement", (2) *avakṣepaṇa* "threat", (3) *sevana* "paying obedience to", (4) *sāhasikya* "acting with violence", (5) *pratiyatna* "imparting a new quality" (6) *prakathana* "recounting in public", or (7) *upayoga* "earmarking (with a view to gaining merit)"'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1. The present rule opens a section which deals with the verbal base *kṛ*– and which ends with P. 1.3.35.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ*) *kṛñaḥ gandhana...upayogeṣu*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of new, incompatible *uddeśya* the previous *uddeśya āñaḥ* (*dhātoḥ hvaḥ*) *sparddhāyam* is automatically discontinued. See Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *gandhana...upayogeṣu* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

4. For the meaning of the ablative *kṛñaḥ* see P. 1.3.17, sub 6.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

5. The verbal base quoted as *kṛñ*–in the rule has been mentioned in the *Dhātup.* (8.10) as *ḌUkṛÑ*–. Since it is a *Ñit* base, it takes the *ātm.* endings in the sense of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* 'the result of the action benefitting the agent', by P. 1.3.72. The separate phrasing of the present rule must therefore be taken to imply that the *ātm.* endings are invariably added to *kṛ*– when conveying the meanings enumerated.

6. The meanings enumerated in the rule are each of them explained by the *KV* in the sense stated.

7. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

8. The examples offered by the *KV* are :

(1) *utkurute* or *udākurute* 'he speaks slightingly of',

(2) *śyeno vartikām udākurute* 'the hawk threatens the partridge',

(3) *gaṇakān upakurute* 'he pays obedience to the astrologers', *mahāmātrān upakurute* 'he pays obedience to the government officials',

(4) *paradārān prakurute* 'he acts with violence towards the wives of others',

(5) *edho dakasyopaskurute* 'the (sandal)wood imparts its quality to the water', *kāṇḍaṃ guḍasyopaskurute* 'the sugarcane imparts its quality to the jaggery',

(6) *gāthāḥ prakurute* 'he recounts the *gāthās* in public', *janāpavādān prakurute* 'he tells in public how people revile each other',

(7) *śataṃ prakurute* 'he earmarks one hundred', *sahasraṃ prakurute* 'he earmarks one thousand'.

In connection with the example mentioned under (5) the *KV* quotes what is apparently a grammatical statement, namely, *ṣaṣṭhīsuṭau karoteḥ pratiyatna eva vidhīyete* 'the genitive ending and (the augment) *sUṬ* (are added after *kṛ*– "to do") when *kṛ*– has the sense of *pratiyatna* only'. Reference is to P. 2.3.53 (for the use of the genitive) and to P. 6.1.139 (for the insertion of *s* in *upa–s–kurute*). The source of the statement is not known.

In connection with the same example the *Padamañjarī* here says that *edhodaka* is to be taken as a *samāhāradvandva*. In that case *edhodakasya upaskurute* means 'he prepares the fuel and the water (for some purpose)'.

The counterexample for the meaning–conditions enumerated is *kaṭaṃ karoti* 'he makes a mat'.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC:0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.3.33 ADHEḤ PRASAHANE '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after the verbal base *kṛÑ–* "to do" immediately preceded by (the preverb) *adhi*, in the sense of *prasahana* "overpowering" '

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The present rule must be a separate rule. This is clear even without the use of *ca*, because of the mention of an *upasarga* alongwith a meaning–condition.

3. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. The word *kṛñaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.32. For the word *dhātoḥ* ' after a verbal base ' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

4. The *uddeśya* is *adheḥ* (*dhātoḥ kṛñaḥ*) *prasahane*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible part–*uddeśya* the previous part–*uddeśya gandhana...upayogeṣu* is automatically discoutinued. Compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning–condition *prasahane* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

5. For the meaning of the ablative *adheḥ* see P. 1.3.17, sub 5.

6. For the separate phrasing of the present rule see P. 1.3.32, sub 5. The *KV* explains that the phrasing of P. 1.3.33 as a separate rule was in order to assign a distinctive meaning to (*kṛ–* in connection with) *adhi*.

7. The *KV* glosses the meaning of *prasahana* as *abhibhava* ' overpowering ', or as *aparājaya* ' non–defeat '.

8. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

9. The example offered by the *KV* is *tam adhicakre* 'he has defeated him'.

The counterexample for the meaning–condition *prasahane* is *artham adhikaroti* ' he oversees finance '.

1.3.34 VEḤ ŚABDAKARMAṆAḤ '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after the verbal base *kṛÑ–* "to make" having (a word signifying) sound as its object (and) immediately preceded by (the preverb) *vi* '

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2, The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. The word *kṛñaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.32. For the word *dhātoḥ* ' after a verbal base ' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

3. The *uddeśya* is *veḥ* (*dhātoḥ kṛñaḥ*) *śabdakarmaṇaḥ*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible part—*uddeśya* the previous part—*uddeśya adheḥ prasahane* is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

4. For the meaning of the ablative *veḥ* see P. 1.3.17, sub 5.

5. For the separate phrasing of the present rule see P. 1.3.32, sub 5.

6. The *KV* explains that the word *karman* (in *śabdakarmaṇaḥ*) is not to be taken in the sense of *kriyā* 'action', but that the *kāraka* called *karman* is meant. The *Nyāsa* on the *KV* here analyzes the cp. *śabdakarman* as *śabdaḥ karma asya* 'of which (verbal base meaning) (a word signifying sound is the object '.

The meaning of the word *śabdakarman* is discussed in detail in the *bhāṣya* on P. 1.4.52. See *KARA*, p. 236-43.

7. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

8. The examples provided by the *KV* are *kroṣṭā vikurute svarān* 'the jackal produces distorted sounds' and *dhvāṅkṣo vikurute svarān* 'the crow produces distorted sounds'.

1.3.35 AKARMAKĀC CA 'also (the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after the verbal base *kṛÑ*– "to make" immediately preceded by the preverb *vi*) when used intransitively'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. To the word *ca* in the present rule two functions may be assigned. First, it marks off P. 1.3.35 from the previous rule which otherwise would have read *veḥ śabdakarmaṇaḥ akarmakāt*, a self-contradictory statement. Secondly, it connects P. 1.3.35 with the topic of the previous rule, namely, the addition of the *ātm.* endings after *kṛÑ*– preceded by *vi*. Compare P. 1.3.26, sub 2.

3. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. The word *kṛÑ* is continued from P. 1.3.32. The word *veḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.34. For *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

4. The *uddeśya* is (*veḥ dhātoḥ kṛñaḥ*) *akarmakāt*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible part—*uddeśya* the previous part—*uddeśya śabdakarmaṇaḥ* is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

5. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

6. The examples provided by the *KV* are *vikurvate saindhavāḥ*, explained by the *KV* as *sādhu dāntāḥ śobhanaṃ valganti* 'well kept in check (the horses) gallop beautifully', and *odanasya pūrṇāś chāttrā vikurvate* 'being full of rice-porridge the students can only move with difficulty'. The *KV* explains *vikurvate* here as *niṣphalaṃ ceṣṭante* 'they move their limbs in vain. According to the *Ñyāsa*, the genitive *odanasya* is by P. 2.2.11 (*suhitārtha*).

1.3.36 SAṂMĀNANOTSAÑJANĀCĀRYAKARAṆAJÑĀNABHṚTIVIGAṆANAVYAYEṢU NIYAḤ '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* " agent " immediately after (the verbal base) *ni-* " to lead " in the sense of (1) *saṃmānana* " respect ", (2) *utsañjana* " lifting up ", (3) *ācārya-karaṇa* " the action of a teacher ", (4) *jñāna* " knowledge " (5) *bhṛti* "wages", (6) *vigaṇana* " payment of what is due ", or (7) *vyaya* " outlay of money ",

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ*) *niyaḥ saṃmānana...vyayeṣu*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* the previous *uddeśya veḥ kṛñaḥ akarmakāt* is automatically discontinued. See Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *saṃmānana...vyayeṣu* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

4. For the meaning of the ablative *niyaḥ* see P. 1.3.17, sub 6. For the ablative form of the verbal base *nī-* see P. 1.3.18, sub 6.

5. The verbal base quoted as *nī-* in the rule has been mentioned in *Dhātup.* (1.950) as *nīÑ-*. Since it is a *Ñit* base, it takes the *ātm.* endings in the sense of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphalam* 'the result of the action benefitting the agent', by P. 1.3.72. The separate phrasing of the present rule must therefore be taken to imply that the *ātm.* endings are invariably added to *nī-* when conveying the meanings enumerated.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

6. The meanings enumerated in the rule are each of them explained by the *KV* in the sense stated.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

7. The examples offered by the *KV* are :

(1) *nayate cārvī lokāyate* ' the teacher introduces (the students) to (the) Lokāyata (doctrine) '. How can this be an example for *saṃmānana* ? The *KV* provides an elaborate explanation. Having coroborated the principles of Lokāyata by means of reasons, he causes his students to understand them. The students, enthralled by the arguments, become respected, honoured.

(2) *māṇavakam udānayate* ' he lifts up the boy '.

(3) *māṇavakam upanayate* ' he performs the *upanayana* ceremony for the boy '. How can this be an example for *ācāryakaraṇa* ? According to the *KV*, the idea is that turning himself into an *ācārya* the officiating brahmin causes the boy to come near to him (*upa*+*nī*-) in such a way that he (the performer of the ceremony) becomes the *ācārya* himself.

Another point to be noted in this connection is that *ācāryakaraṇa* is not really a meaning of *nī*-. It rather gives an indication of the situation in which the verbal base (*upa*+) *nī*- is used.

(4) *nayate cārvī lokāyate* ' the teacher introduces (the students) to (the) Lokāyata (doctrine) '. The *KV* glosses the word *jñāna* as *prameyaniścaya* ' the ascertainment of objects of knowing '.

(5)*karmakarān upanayate* ' he pays wages to the labourers' that is to say, one brings the labourers near by means of paying wages.

(6) *madrāḥ karaṃ vinayante* ' the Madras pay tax '.

(7) *śataṃ vinayate* ' he lays out one hundred ', *sahasraṃ vinayate* ' he lays out one thousand '. As explained by the *KV*, the idea is that money is destined for the acquisition of merit, etc.

As a counterexample for the meaning-condition stated in the rule the *KV* mentions *ajāṃ nayati grāmam* ' he brings the goat to the village '.

8. According to the *SK*, No. 2709, on P. 1.3.35, the meanings *utsañjana*, *jñāna*, *vigaṇana* and *vyaya* are directly expressed (*vācya*) by *nī*-. The other meanings are *prayogopādhi* ' associated (with *nī*-) on account of usage '.

1.3.37 KARTṚSTHE CĀŚARĪRE KARMAṆI ' also (the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* " agent " immediately after the verbal base *nī*- " to lead ") when a non-material item located in the agent functions as the object '

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

2. To the word *ca* in the present rule two functions may be assigned. First it marks off P. 1.3.37 from the previous rule. Secondly, it connects P. 1.3.37 with the topic of the previous rule, namely, the addition of the *ātm.* endings after *nī-*. Compare P. 1.3.35, sub 2.

3. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. The word *niyaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.36. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

4. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ niyaḥ*) *kartṛsthe aśarīre karmaṇi*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible meaning–condition the previous meaning–condition *saṃmānana... upayogeṣu* is automatically discontinued. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 62–63.

5. As explained by the *KV*, *kartṛsthe aśarīre karmaṇi* is a loc. abs. construction.

6. The *KV* glosses the word *śarīra* as *prāṇikāya* 'the body of a living being'. A part of such a body is also called *śarīra*.

7. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

8. The examples provided by the *KV* are *krodhaṃ vinayate* 'he suppresses (his) anger', *manyuṃ vinayate* 'he suppresses his rage'.

The counterexamples for the condition *aśarīre* provided by the *KV* are *gaḍuṃ vinayati* 'he makes the growth subside' and *ghāṭāṃ vinayati* presumably having a similar meaning.

The counterexamples for the condition *karmaṇi* are *buddhyā vinayati* 'he behaves with modesty on account of knowledge', *prajñayā vinayati* 'he behaves with modesty on account of insight' (meanings uncertain).

1.3.38 VṚTTISARGATĀYANEṢU KRAMAḤ '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") immediately after (the verbal base) *kram-* "to move forward" in the sense of (1) *vṛtti* "uninterrupted engagement (in)", (2) *sarga* "enthusiasm", or (3) *tāyana* "full development"'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1. The present rule opens the section dealing with the verbal base *kram-* which ends with P. 1.3.43.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ*) *kramaḥ vṛttisargatāyaneṣu*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* the previous *uddeśya niyaḥ kartṛsthe aśarīre karmaṇi* has been automatically discontinued. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *vṛtti...tāyaneṣu* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

4. For the meaning of the ablative *kramaḥ* see P. 1.3.17, sub 6.

5. The *KV* glosses the word *vṛtti* as *apratibandha* 'non-obstruction', *sarga* as *utsāha* 'vigour, enthusiasm', and *tāyana* as *sphītatā* 'a thriving state'.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

7. The examples provided by the *KV* are :

(1) *ṛkṣv asya kramate buddhiḥ* 'his mind is continuously engaged in the Ṛgveda', and *yajuḥsv asya kramate buddhiḥ* 'his mind is continuously engaged in the Yajurveda',

(2) *vyākaraṇādhyayanāya kramate* 'he shows enthusiasm for the study of grammar',

(3) *asmin śāstrāṇi kramante* 'in him the sciences have reached their full development',

The counterexample for the meanings stated provided by the *KV* is *apakramati* 'he goes away'.

1.3.39 UPAPARĀBHYĀM '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after the verbal base *kram-* "to move forward" immediately preceded by (the preverb) *upa* or *parā* '

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1 3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively, The whole rule P. 1.3.38 is also continued. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *upaparābhyām* (*dhātoḥ kramaḥ vṛttisargatāyaneṣu*). The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*).

For the question whether the meaning-condition *vṛtti...tāyaneṣu* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

4. For the meaning of the abl. *upaparābhyām* see P. 1.3.17, sub 5. We note that in *upaparābhyām* the du. abl. ending *-bhyām* is used, and not the older ending *-os*, for which see P. 1.3.10, sub 4, ad P. 3.2.5.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

5. The *KV* wonders why the present rule has been separately stated, since the previous rule already prescribes the *ātm.* endings after *kram-* in the meanings stated. The answer is that the present rule must have the character of a *niyama* 'restriction'. That is to say that by P. 1.3.38 being a general rule we add the *atm.* endings after *kram-* not preceded by a preverb and conveying the meanings stated. By P. 1.3.39, on the other hand, we add the *ātm.* endings after *kram-* in the meanings stated only when preceded by the preverbs *upa* or *parā*, not any other preverb.

6. Is there any formal indication that P. 1.3.38 and 39 are two separate rules? Such a formal indication may be found in the order in which the various rule-constituents are mentioned. What we find in the rules P. 1.3.17–40 is that when a preverb is mentioned in a rule, it invariably takes the first place, and that the verbal base, when mentioned together with either a preverb or a meaning-condition takes the second place. Now, if P. 1.3.38–39 were one rule, it would read *vṛttisargatāyaneṣu kramaḥ upaparābhyām*, with the preverbs mentioned in the last place. This goes against the order adopted so far. We may therefore assume that P. 1.3.38 and 39 are meant to be two different rules.

7. For the *dyotaka*-role of the preverbs in connection with the verbal base meanings see P. 1.3.23, sub 4, and P. 1.3.31, sub 6.

8. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

9. The examples offered by the *KV* are *upakramate* 'he attacks' and *parākramate* 'he advances to attack',.

The counterexample for the condition *upaparābhyām* offered by the KV is *saṃkrāmati* 'he passes from one place to another' (vowel-lengthening by P. 7.3.76).

1.3.40 ĀṄA UDGAMANE '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after the verbal base *kram-* "to move forward") immediately preceded by (the preverb) *āṄ* (and) when conveying the sense of *udgamana* "rising"

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. The word *kramaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.38. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *āṅaḥ* (*dhātoḥ kramaḥ*) *udgamane*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible part-

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

uddeśya the previous part-*uddeśya upaparābhyām vṛttisargatāyaneṣu* has been automatically discontinued. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, P. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *udgamane* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14. sub. 3.

4. For the meaning of the abl. *āṅaḥ* see P. 1.3.17, sub 5.

5. The examples provided by the *KV* are *ākramate ādityaḥ* 'the sun rises', *ākramate candramāḥ* 'the moon rises' and *akramante jyotīṃṣi* 'the celestial bodies rise'.

The counterexample for the meaning-condition *udgamane* provided by the *KV* is *ākramati māṇavakaḥ kutupam* 'the boy takes place on a seat of *darbha* grass' (see the *Padamañjarī* here).

6. Kātyāyana has phrased one *Vt.* on the present rule. It says that the *ātm.* endings are added after *kram-* when the sense conveyed is that of the rising of celestial bodies. Patañjali provides the counterexample *ākramati dhūmo harmyatalāt* 'the smoke rises up from the floor of the mansion' (according to the reading of the Ben. ms.) (*Mbh.* I, p. 282. line 21).

The Kielhorn text reads *ākramati dhūmo harmyatalam* 'the smoke pervades the floor of the mansion'. Here the example serves as a counterexample for the condition *udgamane* in the *Vt.* But this cannot be correct, because the counterexample should refer to the word *jyotiṣām* in the *Vt.*, which is Kātyāyana's correction for P. 1.3.40.

According to Kaiyaṭa on *Bh.* No. 1 on the present rule, the base *kram-* when meaning 'to rise' is intransitive. Nāgeśa (ibid.) says that the reading *harmyatalāt* is the only correct one according to tradition. This is also the reading adopted by the *KV.*

1.3.41 VEḤ PĀDAVIHARAṆE '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") immediately after the verbal base *kram-* "to move forward") immediately preceded by (the preverb) *vi*, in the sense of the stride (of a horse'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra.* See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. The word *kramaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.38. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *veḥ* (*dhātoḥ kramaḥ*) *pādaviharaṇe*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible part-*uddeśya*

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

the previous part-*uddeśya āṅa udgamane* is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *pādaviharaṇe* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

4. For the meaning of the abl. *veḥ* see P. 1.3.17, sub 5.

5. The *KV* glosses the word *viharaṇa* as *vikṣepa*, literally 'throwing asunder'. As is clear from the *KV*, we have to think of the way in which horses, etc. "throw asunder" their legs, since we are informed that *vikramaṇa* refers to the particular way of moving which horses, etc. have.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

7. The examples offered by the *KV* are *suṣṭhu vikramate* 'steps well' and *sādhu vikramate* 'steps nicely'.

8. The counterexample for the condition *pādaviharaṇa* is *vikrāmaty ajinasandhiḥ* 'the joint in the antelope-skin splits'

1.3.42 PROPĀBHYĀṂ SAMARTHĀBHYĀM '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after the verbal base *kram-* "to move forward") immediately preceded by (the preverbs) *pra* or *upa* which have the same meaning'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P.1.3.12 and 14 respectively. The word *kramaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.38. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *propābhyāṃ samarthābhyāṃ* (*dhātoḥ kramaḥ*). The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible part-*uddeśya* the previous part-*uddeśya veḥ pādaviharaṇe* is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

4. For the meaning of the abl. *propābhyām* see P. 1.3.17, sub 5. We note that in *propābhyām* the du. abl. ending *-bhyām* is used, and not the older ending *-os*, for which see P. 1.3.10, sub 4, ad P. 3.2.5.

5. The *KV* explains the word *samartha* in the present rule as *tulyārtha* 'conveying the same meaning', namely, that of the beginning of an action.

The *Padamañjarī* here notes that the word *samartha* analyzed as *samaḥ arthaḥ yayoḥ* '(those) two of which the meaning is the same' should, in fact, read *samārtha*. To justify the form *samartha*, *Vt.* IV on P. 6.1.94 is invoked.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Alternatively, the form can be derived as *sam* + *artha* in which *sam* means *sama*.

The *Padamañjarī* also notes that the word *samartha* is wellknown from P. 2.1.1 in the sense of *sambandha* ' (syntactic) connection '. In fact, this is the meaning assigned to *samartha* by the *KV*, when P. 2.1.1 is interpreted to mean *samarthānāṃ padānāṃ vidhiḥ*. But, the *Padamañjarī* says; to adopt this meaning for *samartha* in the case of a preverb and a verbal base makes no sense, because the relation between a preverb and a verb (by P. 1.4.59) is fixed. *Upasargas* cannot be used independently, they are always dependent on the verbal base meaning, that is, *kriyā* ' action ', unlike a *pada* (fully) finished word '. Therefore in the present rule the word *samartha* can only mean ' conveying the same meaning '.

7. The examples offered by the *KV* are *prakramate bhoktum* ' he begins to eat ' and *upakramate bhoktum* ' he begins to eat '.

The conterexamples for the qualifier *samarthābhyām* are *pūrvedyuḥ prakrāmati* ' he departs in the morning ' and *aparedyur upakrāmati* ' he returns later in the day '.

The *KV* raises the question why in the latter counterexample the *ātm.* ending is not added by P. 1.3.39. The answer is that in this rule the meaning-condition *vṛttisargatāyaneṣu* is continued from P. 1.3.38. But these are not meanings conveyed by *kram-* in the counterexample.

1.3.43 ANUPASARGĀD VĀ ' (the *ātm.* endings in the sense of *kartṛ* " agent " are) preferably (added immediately after the verbal base *kram-* " to move forward ") not preceded by a preverb '

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. The word *kramaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.38. For the word *dhātoḥ* ' after a verbal base ' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *anupasargād* (*dhātoḥ kramaḥ*). The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*) *vā*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible part-*uddeśya* the previous part—*uddeśya propābhyāṃ samarthābhyām* is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, P. 271, convention 4.

4. For the meaning assigned to *vā* see Kiparski 1979, p. 1. We note that *vā* has been put at the end of the present rule. Compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 244.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

5. According to the *KV*, P. 1.3.43 is an *aprāptavibhāṣā*. That is to say, we can't have the addition of the *ātm.* endings after *kram-* without *upasarga* (and not conditioned by the meanings *vṛtti*, etc. stated by P. 1.3.38) by any other rule than the present rule, and the present rule prescribes an option in the sense that after *kram-* without *upasarga* the *ātm.* endings are preferably used.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

7. The example provided by the *KV* is *kramate* 'he moves forward' (the preferred form) and *krāmati* 'he moves forward' (vowel-lengthening by P. 7.3.76).

The counterexample for the condition *anupasargāt* provided by the *KV* is *saṃkrāmati* 'he passes from one place to another'.

1.3.44 APAHNAVE JÑAḤ '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") immediately after (the verbal base) *jñā-* "to know" in the sense of denial'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1. The present rule opens a brief section dealing with the verbal base *jñā-* which ends with P. 1.3.46.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ*) *jñaḥ apahnave*. The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* the previous *uddeśya* is automatically discontinued. The word *vā* from P. 1.3.43 is also discontinued, see Joshi-Bhate 1984, P. 271, convention 4, and p. 273, convention 26.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *apahnave* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

4. For the meaning of the ablative *jñaḥ* see P. 1.3.17, sub 5. For the derivation of the form *jñaḥ* compare that of *daḥ*, P. 1.3.20, sub 7.

Pāṇini uses *jñaḥ* regularly as the ablative of *jñā*. Compare P. 1.3.58,76; 2.3.22 (*sam+jñā*), 2.3.51 and 3.2.6.

5. The *KV* glosses the word *apahnava* as *apahnuti* or *apalāpa* both meaning 'denial'.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule. One question which may be asked *en passant* is why Patañjali chose to comment on particular rules only leaving out others.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

7. The rule itself does not say whether *jñā-* in the meaning indicated should be preceded by a preverb or not. The *KV* says, it should. By way of explanation the *Padamañjarī* refers to P. 1.3.76. This rule says that *jñā-* not preceded by a preverb takes the *ātm.* endings in the sense of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* 'the result of the action benefitting the agent'. Therefore, since we can have the *ātm.* endings after *jñā-* without *upasarga* by P. 1.3.76 in the sense indicated, it is inferred that P. 1.3.44 deals with *jñā-* with *upasarga*.

8. The *KV* provides the examples *śatam apajānīte* 'he denies (that he owes) one hundred', *sahasram apajānīte* 'he denies (that he owes) one thousand'. The *Nyāsa* here informs us that *jā* is substituted for *jñā* by P. 7.3.79, and that the *ā* of the *vikaraṇa Śna* is replaced by *ī*, by P. 6.4.113.

The counterexample for the condition *apahnave* provided by the *KV* is *na tvaṃ kiṃcid api jānāsi* 'you do not know anything at all'.

1.3.45 AKARMAKĀC CA 'also ((the *ātm.* endings are) added in the sense of *kartṛ* 'agent' immediately after the verbal base *jñā-* "to know") when used intransitively'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. For an identical rule see P. 1.3.26 and 35.

3. For the function of the word *ca* in the present rule see P. 1.3.35, sub 2. The connection in P. 1.3.45 with the topic of the previous rule concerns the addition of the *ātm.* endings after *jñā-*.

4. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. The word *jñaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.44. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

5. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ jñaḥ*) *akarmakāt*. The *vidheya* is (*kartarī ātmanepadam*). The meaning-condition *apahnave* from P. 1.3.44 is discontinued on the basis of *sāmarthya*. That is to say, its continuation in the present rule does not make sense, because *jñā-* when conveying the meaning *apahnava* is *sakarmaka* 'transitive'.

6. As explained by the *KV*, we can have the *ātm.* endings for *jñā-* without *upasarga* in the sense of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* 'the result of the action benefitting the agent' by P. 1.3.76. It is therefore inferred that by the present rule we can have these endings after *jñā-*, even when the result of the action does not benefit the agent.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

7. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

8. The examples provided by the *KV* are *sarpiṣo jānīte* 'he proceeds (to find out something) with the help of ghee' and *madhuno jānīte* 'he proceeds (to find out something) with the help of honey'. For what is wanted to be found out see TA, *Bh*. No. 1 on P. 2.2.10, and Note (90).

The question is, of course, how in the examples quoted, the verb *jñā-* can be said to be intransitive, because to all appearances *sarpis* and *madhu* are the objects of *jñā-*. The *KV* explains that here *sarpis* and *madhu* are not intended as *jñeya* 'a thing to be known', but as the *karaṇa* 'instrument' with regard to *pravṛtti* 'proceeding (to act)' which presupposes a stage called *jñāna*. Here reference is first to P. 2.3.51 which contains the condition *avidartha* 'not possessing the sense of knowing' for *jñā-*. Secondly, reference may be to the analysis of an action given by Patañjali in *Bh*. No. 13 on P. 1.4.32 (see *KARA*, p. 123). The first three stages of such a process are indicated as *saṃdarśana* '(mentally) conceiving', *prārthayati* 'wishing for' and *adhyavasyati* 'deciding'. Only then one proceeds to act. The first three stages mentioned all come under *jñāna* in some way or other. In accordance with P. 2.3.51 the *KV* then explains the expression *sarpiṣo jānīte* as *sarpiṣā upāyena pravartate* 'he proceeds to act with *sarpis* as a means'.

The counterexample for the condition *akarmakāt* provided by the *KV* is *svareṇa putraṃ jānāti* 'he knows his son by his voice'.

1.3.46 SAṂPRATIBHYĀM ANĀDHYĀNE '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after the verb base *jñā-* "to know" immediately preceded by (the preverbs) *sam* or *prati*, except in the sense of remembering longingly'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. The word *jñaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.44. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *saṃpratibhyāṃ* (*dhātoḥ jñaḥ*) *anādhyāne*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). The condition *akarmakāt* from P. 1.3.45 is discontinued on the basis of *sāmarthya*. That is to say, its continuation in the present rule does not make sense, because *jñā-* preceded by *sam* or *prati* is a *sakarmaka* 'transitive' verb.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *anādhyāne* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

4. For the meaning of the abl. *saṃpratibhyām* see 1.3.17, sub 5. We note that in *saṃpratibhyām* the du. abl. ending *-bhyām* is used, and not the older ending *-os*, for which see P. 1.3.10, sub 4, ad P. 3.2.5.

5. The *KV* glosses the word *ādhyāna* as *utkaṇṭhāsmaraṇam* 'remembering with longing'. For the construction of the negation in *anādhyāne* see P. 1.3.20, sub 9.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

7. The examples offered by the *KV* are *śataṃ saṃjānīte* 'he acknowledges (that he owes) one hundred', *sahasraṃ saṃjānīte* 'he acknowledges (that he owes) one thousand', *śataṃ pratijānīte* 'he admits (that he owes) one hundred' and *sahasraṃ pratijānīte* 'he admits (that he owes) one thousand'.

The counterexamples for the condition *anādhyāne* provided by the *KV* are *matuḥ saṃjānāti* 'he remembers his mother longingly' and *pituḥ saṃjānāti* 'he remembers his father longingly'. As explained by the *Nyāsa* here, the genitive ending is added by P. 2.3.52.

1.3.47 BHĀSANOPASAṂBHĀṢĀJÑĀNAYATNAVIMATYUPAMANTRAṆEṢU VADAḤ (the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after (the verbal base) *vad-* "to speak" in the sense of *bhāsana* "brilliance", *upasaṃbhāṣā* "conciliation", *jñāna* "proper understanding", *yatna* "effort", *vimati* "difference of opinion, quarrel" and *upamantraṇa* "secret communication with the intention of seduction"

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *bhāsanopasaṃbhāṣā . upamantraṇeṣu* (*dhātoḥ*) *vadaḥ* The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* the previous *uddeśya* is automatically cancelled. See Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *bhāsanopasaṃbhāṣā... upamantraṇeṣu* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

4. The present rule opens a short section of rules (up to P. 1.3.50 inclusive) which deal with the verbal base *vad-*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

5. The *KV* explains each word of the meaning-condition with the help of a synonym, and provides examples succesively, as follows :

(1) *vadate cārvī lokāyate* ' the teacher excels in explaining Lokāyata (doctrine) '. Compare P. 1.3.36, sub 7, example (4).

(2) *karmakarān upavadate* ' he pacifies the labourers '.

(3) *vadate cārvī lokāyate* ' the teacher knows how to explain Lokāyata (doctrine) '.

(4) *kṣetre vadate* ' he displays an effort with regard to his field ', *gṛhe vadate* ' he displays an effort with regard to his house '.

5. *Kṣetre vivadante* ' they quarrel with regard to the field (or, in the field) ', *gṛhe vivadante* ' they quarrel with regard to the house (or, in the house) '.

(6) *kulabhāryām upavadate* ' he secretly communicates with the noble wife in order to seduce her ', *paradārān upavadate* ' he secretly communicates with wives of others in order to seduce them '.

The *Nyāsa* informs us of the contents of the secret communication. What is said is *bhadre bhajasva mām idaṃ te dāsyāmi* ' o beautiful one, love me. I shall give you this (trinket) '.

7. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

1.3.48 VYAKTAVĀCĀM SAMUCCĀRAṆE (the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* " agent " immediately after the verbal base *vad-* " to produce sound ") in the sense of simultaneous utterance of those who possess articulate sound '

1. This is a *vidhisūtra.* See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* ' after a verbal base ' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *vadaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.47.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ vadaḥ*) *vyaktavācām samuccāraṇe.* The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya bhāsana...upamantraṇeṣu* is automatically cancelled. Compare Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

4. The previous meaning-conditions from P. 1 3.47 are discontinued on the basis of *sāmarthya*, that is, because it doesn't make sense to continue them in the present rule. Compare Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 45-46.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

5. The verb *vad-* is used in Skt in the sense of speaking, but also in the sense of producing sound by animals or musical instruments. It has been mentioned in the *Dhātup.* 1.1058 in the sense of *vyaktavāc* 'a clear, distinct sound'. This being so, the question is why the word *vyaktavāc* has been used in the rule. According to the *KV*, this is for *prasiddhy-upasaṃgraha* 'acceptance of what is known to people'. What is known to people is that men possess articulate speech.

6. Discussing the same question in his *bhāṣya* on the present rule Patañjali quotes part of a verse : *varatanu saṃpravadanti kukkuṭāḥ* (*Mbh.* I, p. 283, line 3). It is not attested before Patañjali. But Kumāradāsa referred to in *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* (*Kāvyamālā* 14, 1934, p. 151) quotes what is presumably the complete stanza. It reads as follows : *ayi vijahīhi dṛḍhopagūhanaṃ tyaja navasaṃgamabhīru vallabham/aruṇakarodgama eṣa vartate varatanu saṃpravadanti kukkuṭāḥ //* 'o, let go of the firm embrace, leave your lover, you timid one because of the recent intercourse. The reddish rays (of dawn) become visible, o you of the beautiful body, the cocks start to crow together'. Here *aruṇakara* is not taken as a *bv.* cp. meaning 'the sun', but as a *kdh.* cp., because from the context it is clear that reference must be to a stage prior to sunrise. The stanza is interesting because it represents a Skt. instance of what in medieval European literature is known as *alba*, a lyric form whose topic is the separation of lovers at early dawn. The metre of Skt stanza is *mālatī*, also known as *varatanu*.

Since the cocks possess a clear, distinct sound there is a chance for adding an *ātm.* ending after the base *saṃpravad-*. To prevent this, it is assumed that *vyaktavāc* in the rule means *vyaktavāc* to a higher degree, pre-eminently *vyaktavāc* (*prakarṣagati*). Those known to be *vyaktavāc* to a higher degree are men who use speechsounds (*Mbh.* I, p. 283, lines 5–7). Or, alternatively *vyaktavāc* should be taken to mean those in whose speech the sounds are clear (*Mbh.* I, p. 283, lines 9–11).

7. The examples provided by the *KV* are *saṃpravadante brāhmaṇāḥ* 'the brahmins speak simultaneously' (i. e. they recite in chorus), and *saṃpravadante kṣatriyāḥ* 'the kṣatriyas speak simultaneously'.

1.3.49 ANOR AKARMAKĀT (the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after the verbal base *vad-* "to speak" in the sense of simultaneous utterance of those who possess articulate speech) preceded by (the preverb) *anu*, when (*vad-*) is used intransitively'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The words *vadaḥ* and *vyaktavācām samuccāraṇe* are continued from P. 1.3.47 and 48 respectively.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ vadaḥ vyaktavācāṃ samuccāraṇe*) *anor akarmakāt*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*).

4. The *KV* explains that the preverb *anu* is used in the sense of *sādṛśya* 'similarity'.

5. For *akarmakāt* see P. 1.3.26, sub 5.

6. The *KV* provides the examples *anuvadate kaṭhaḥ kalāpasya* 'Kaṭha repeats after Kalāpa', *anuvadate maudgaḥ paippalādasya* 'Maudga repeats after Paippalāda'. That is to say, Kaṭha and Maudga recite texts as thay were taught by Kalāpa and Paippalāda.

According to the *Padamañjarī*, the genitive in *kalāpasya* and *paippalādasya* is by P. 2.3 50.

7. The counterexample for the condition *akarmakāt* provided by the *KV* is *pūrvam eva yajur uditam anuvadati* 'he repeats the sacrificial formula recited already earlier'. The counterexample for *vyaktavācām* is *anuvadatī vīṇā* 'the *vīṇā* resounds'.

8. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

1.3.50 VIBHĀṢĀ VIPRALĀPE ' (the *ātm.* endings are added after the verbal base *vad-* "to speak" in the sense of simultaneous utterance of those who possess articulate sound, but) preferably not in the sense of mutual disagreement'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The words *vadaḥ* and *vyaktavācāṃ samuccāraṇe* are continued from P. 1.3.47 and 48 respectively.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ vadaḥ vyaktavātāṃ samuccāraṇe*). The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*) *vibhāṣā*.

4. For the interpretation of the word *vibhāṣā* see Kiparski 1979, p. 1, and *AP* I, ad P. 1.1.44, sub 8.

According to the *KV*, the *vibhāṣā* mentioned in the rule is a *prāptavibhāṣā*, for which see *AP*, I, p. 52–53, and Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 74.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

5. The condition *akarmakāt* from P. 1.3.49 is dropped on the basis of *sāmarthya*, that is, because it doesn't make sense in the present rule. Compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 45–46. The condition *vyaktavācāṃ samuccāraṇe* from P. 1.3.48 is not discontinued by *vipralāpe*, because the two meaning-conditions are not incompatible.

6. The *KV* provides the examples *vipravadante|vipravadanti sāṃvatsarāḥ* 'the astrologers contradict each other' and *vipravadante|vipravadanti mauhūrtāḥ* 'the astrologers contradict each other'.

7. The counterexample provided by the *KV* for the condition *vipralāpe* is *saṃpravadante brāhmaṇāḥ* 'the brahmins recite in chorus' (according to P. 1.3.48). The counterexample for *vyaktavācām* is *vipravadanti śakunayaḥ* 'the birds utter sound in various ways' (see P. 1.3.48, sub 5). The counterexample for *samuccāraṇa* is *krameṇa mauhūrtā mauhūrtena saha vipravadanti* 'the astrologers one after the other disagree with the astrologer'.

8. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

1.3.51 AVĀD GRAḤ '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after (the verbal base) *gṝ-* "to swallow" preceded by *ava*'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *avād* (*dhātoḥ*) *graḥ*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new incompatible *uddeśya* the previous *uddeśya* is automatically cancelled. See Joshi–Bhate 1984. P 271, convention 4.

The word *vibhāṣā* from P. 1.3.50. is not continued in the present rule, because P. 1.3.50 is a *prāptavibhāṣā* rule. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, P. 74.

4. The *Padamañjarī* mentions a variant reading *giraḥ*. Here substitution of *i* has taken place for the verbal base vowel, although factually *gṝ-* functions as a nominal base followed by a case ending. Then how to explain the substitution? The explanation is that the nominal base is still considered to be a verbal base, because it is the quotation form of a verbal base. As explained by the *Nyāsa*, the *i*-substitution is by P. 7.1.100. After the *i* the consonant *r* is added by P. 1.1.51. The *Padamañjarī* adds that in the *graḥ* we have to consider that it is the quotation of the mere form of the verbal base. Here P. 6.1.77 is applied before the case-ending.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The form *graḥ* is also used in P. 8.2.20.

5. Kātyāyana has phrased one *vārttika* on the present rule. It says that instead of *graḥ* the rule should read *girateḥ* 'after (the verbal base quoted as) *girati*'. This is in order to make clear that the base *gṝ- nigaraṇe* 'gṝ- in the sense of swallowing' is meant (*Dhātup.* 6.117), and not *gṝ- śabde* 'gṛ in the sense of calling' (*Dhātup.* 9.28). Patañjali rejects the *Vt.* because *gṝ-* preceded by *ava* can only be *gṝ- nigaraṇe* (*Mbh.* I, P. 283, line 15). The *KV* follows Patañjali.

1.3.52 SAMAḤ PRATIJÑĀNE (the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after the verbal base *gṝ-* "to swallow") preceded by (the preverb) *sam*, in the sense of *pratijñāna* "agreement, promise"[1].

1 This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *graḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.51.

3. The *uddeśya* is *samaḥ* (*dhātoḥ graḥ*) *pratijñāne*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). The word *samaḥ* cancels *avāt* from P. 1.3.51.

4. The *KV* explains the word *pratijñāna* as *abhyupagama* 'assent, agreement'.

5. The *KV* provides the examples *śatena saṃgirate* 'he agrees to one hundred/he promises one hundred' and *nityaṃ śabdaṃ saṃgirate* 'he agrees to *śabda* "word" being eternal'.

6. The *Padamañjarī* quotes a definition of *abhyupagama* in order to point out that *pratijñāna* and *abhyupagama* are not synonymous. *Pratijñāna* means the promise to fulfill an obligation, whereas *abhyupagama* means agreeing with somebody else's opinion. But the *KV* apparently takes the two words to be synonyms. The examples quoted by the *KV* go with both meanings.

The counterexample provided by the *KV* is *saṃgirati grāsam* 'he swallows a morsel'.

7. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

1.3.53 UDAŚ CARAḤ SAKARMAKĀT '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") immediately after (the verbal base) *car-* "to move" preceded by (the preverb) *ud* when used transitively'

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *udaḥ* (*dhātoḥ*) *caraḥ sakarmakāt*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* the previous *uddeśya* is automatically cancelled. See Joshi-Bhate 1984, P. 271, convention 4.

4. The examples provided by the *KV* are *geham uccarate* 'he leaves the house', *kuṭumbam uccar-* 'he leaves the family behind' and *guruvacanam uccarate* 'he ignores the words of his teacher'.

The counterexample provided by the *KV* is *bāṣpam uccarati* 'tears are rising'. Here *uccar-* is used intransitively.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

1.3.54 SAMAS TṚTIYĀYUKTĀT '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after the verbal base car- "to move") preceded by (the preverb) *sam* (and) connected with (a noun) ending in an instrumental case ending'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *caraḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.53.

3. The *uddeśya* is *samaḥ* (*dhātoḥ caraḥ*) *tṛtīyāyuktāt*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). The word *udaḥ* from P. 1.3.53 is cancelled by *samaḥ*. The word *sakarmakāt* from P. 1.3.53 is cancelled by the incompatible condition *tṛtīyāyuktāt*.

The constituent *tṛtīyā* in the cp. *tṛtīyāyuktāt* is interpreted to mean *tṛtīyānta* '(a noun) ending in the instrumental case ending' by applying the *tadantavidhi* (P. 1.1.72).

5. Patañjali discusses the question whether the word *tṛtīyā* in *tṛtīyā-yuktāt* should be taken to refer to the meaning of instrument expressed by an instrumental case ending, or rather to the instrumental case ending itself. In the first case, an *ātm.* ending would have to be added in the text which reads *ubhau lokau saṃcarasi imaṃ ca devala* 'o Devala you pass through both

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

worlds, this one and the other'. The source of the quotation has not been identified. But adding an *ātm.* ending after *saṃcar-* here is clearly undesired.

The point, as explained by the Nyāsa, is that here also we may understand the meaning of an instrument with which the passing through takes place, *tapas* 'ascetism' or *śruta* 'Vedic learning'. Patañjali says that in connection with any verb we may understand the meaning of an instrument. Therefore in interpreting the word *tṛtīyā* we must have recourse to *prakarṣagati* 'the understanding of a higher degree'. That is to say, we should take *tṛtīyāyukta* to mean that which has pre-eminently connection with an instumental ending, namely, a noun ending in the *tṛtīyāvibhakti*, not a verb connected with an instrumental meaning (*Mbh.* I, p. 283, lines 20–22).

6. The *KV* provides the example *aśvena saṃcarate* 'he moves by horse'. Here the word *aśvena* has been used, a noun ending in the instrumental case ending. Therefore P. 1.3.54 applies.

The counterexample for the condition *tṛtīyāyuktāt* provided by the *KV* is the line quoted by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 283, line 18), for which see under 4. The *KV* explains that although here it is possible to connect the verbal base meaning with an instrumental meaning, that instrumental meaning has not been expressed by a noun in the instrumental. Therefore P. 1.3.54 does not apply.

1.3.55 DĀṆAŚ CA CEC CATURTHYARTHE 'also (the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") immediately after (the verbal base) *dāṆ* "to give" (preceded by the perverb *sam* and connected with a noun in the instrumental case), if that (instrumental case ending) is used in the sense of a dative case ending.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra.* See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P.1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The whole rule P. 1.3.54 is continued in the present rule, except that the item *caraḥ* continued in P. 1.3.54 is cancelled by the incompatible item *dāṇaḥ.*

3. The *uddeśya* (is *samaḥ dhātoḥ*) *dāṇaḥ* (*tṛtīyāyuktāt*) *cec caturthyarthe.* The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam.*

4. The word *ca* in the present rule marks the boundary with P. 1.3.54. Compare Joshi-Bhate 1983, p. 32–35. Here P. 1.3.55 may be considered to be

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

an associative digression, because this rule incidentally introduces a conjunctive *vidheya*. compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 99, 197.

5. The verbal base *dāṆ* is mentioned in the *Dhātup.* 1.977 in the sense of giving. Before a suffix containing the *anubandha Ś*, *dā-* is replaced by *yacch-*, by P. 7.3.78.

6. Patañjali wonders how an instrumental case ending can be used in the sense of a dative case ending. But there are such usages. According to Patañjali, they are usages dealing with *aśiṣṭavyavahāra* 'uncivilized behaviour'. Examples are *dāsyā samprayacchate* 'he presents (something) to the slave–girl', *vṛṣalyā saṃprayacchate* 'he presents (something) to the outcaste woman' (*Mbh.* I, p. 284, lines 3–4). The *KV* has *dāsyā mālāṃ saṃprayaccate* 'he presents a garland to the slave–girl', and explains that the gift is made with amorous designs.

Patañjali adds that in the case of civilized behaviour the *parasmaipada* endings are used, with the dative ending, as in *brāhmaṇībhyaḥ saṃprayacchatī* 'he presents (something) to the brahmin women' (*Mbh.* I, p. 284, line 4). Here, apparently, there is no question of amorous designs.

But if the question is essentially one of behaviour, whether civilized or not, then why have a rule of grammar ? That rule is still required to have the instrumental case ending and the *ātmanepada* endings. In this connection Patañjali quotes a statement. It says that the instrumental case ending is added in the sense of *sahayukta* (reference is to P. 2.3.19), and that the *ātm.* endings are prescribed in the sense of *vyatihāra* 'exchange' (reference to P. 1.3.14).

7. The word *samaḥ* continued in the rule, if taken as an ablative by P. 1.1.67, requires immediate sequence of *sam* and *dā-*. But the examples are of *saṃpradā-* where *pra* comes in between. Then how can P. 1.3.55 become applicable here at all ? This is the question raised by the *KV*. The answer is that the word *samaḥ* in the rule is not to be taken as an ablative, but as a genitive in the sense of *viśeṣaṇa* 'qualifier'. Thus, as explained by the *Nyāsa*, between *sam* and *dā-* a qualifier-qualified relation holds which does not require immediate sequence. The exact construction, according to the *Nyāsa*, is *samo viśeṣaṇasya sambandhi yo viśeṣyo dāṇ* '(after that verbal base) *dāṆ* which is the qualified correlative of the qualifier *sam*'. The *Padamañjarī* notes that the same reasoning applies to the example quoted as *aśvena samudācarate* 'he moves by horse' for P. 1.3.54. But, obviously, *samaḥ* in P. 1.3.54 and continued in P. 1.3.55, is an ablative, and the examples do not strictly adhere to the rule.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

8. The counterexample for the condition *caturthyarthe* provided by the *KV* is *pāṇinā saṃprayacchati* ' he presents with his hand '.

9. The *KV* mentions as a *vārttika* what is actually the slightly changed wording of a statement by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 284, line 3). It says that to express uncivilized behaviour the instrumental case ending is used in the sense of the dative ending.

1.3.56 UPĀD YAMAḤ SVAKARAṆE ' (the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* " agent ") immediately after (the verbal base) *yam-* " to hold in check " preceded by (the preverb) *upa*, in the sense of ' marrying '

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *upād* (*dhātoḥ*) *yamaḥ svakaraṇe*. The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* the previous *uddeśya* is automatically cancelled. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, P. 271, convention 4.

4. The *KV* explains that *svakaraṇa* in the rule is to be taken in the sense of *pāṇigrahaṇaviśiṣṭaṃ svakaraṇam* ' accepting as his own qualified by the taking of the hand ', as is the case in the marriage ceremony.

5. Instead of *svakaraṇa* why not *svīkaraṇa* ? This is the question Patañjali has in mind. In *svaṃ śāṭakāntam upayacchati* ' he seizes the hem of his cloth ' a *parasmaipada* ending is used, because the sense conveyed is not that of making his own what was not his own previously. But the meaning conveyed by *svakaraṇa* in the rule is precisely that. So why not *svīkaraṇa* (by P. 5.4.50 and P. 7.4.32)? The answer is *vicitrās taddhitavṛttayaḥ* ' the *taddhita*–formations are manifold ' (*Mbh.* I, p. 284, line 11). That is why the *cvi*-formation is not applied in *svakaraṇa*.

6. The example provided by the *KV* is *bhāryām upayacchate* ' he takes as a wife '. The counterexample for the condition *svakaraṇe* is *devadatto yajñadattasya bhāryām upayacchati* ' Devadatta takes Yajñadatta's wife as his own '. No question of marriage here.

1.3.57 JÑĀŚRUSMṚDṚŚĀṂ SANAḤ ' (the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* " agent ") immediately after (the desiderative suffix) *saN* (added) after (the verbal bases) *jñā-* " to know ", *śru-* " to hear ", *smṛ-* " to remember " or *dṛś-* " to see " '

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1 3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* (here *dhātūnām*, with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*, See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 220; the sg. ablative is replaced by a pl. genitive, as required by the context) see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātūnāṃ*) *jñāśrusmṛdṛśāṃ sanaḥ*. The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* the previous *uddeśya* is automatically discontinued. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, P. 271, convention 4.

4. The *KV* explains the sg. abl. as a pl. gen. (*sannantānām*) and thereby takes the rule to mean that the verbal bases mentioned takes the *ātm.* endings when ending in *saN*. In the translation adopted above, however, *sanaḥ* is taken as a technical abl. (P. 1.1.67) and the ending *-ām* is taken in the sense of an abl. Compare P. 1.3.10 sub 4, on P. 3.2.5. The reason for doing so is that in a sequence of three items, to indicate the order in which the items come after one another, two ablatives are required. The technical meaning of the genitive, on the other hand, is always one of replacement.

5. The desiderative suffix *saN* is prescribed by P. 3.1.7. A base in *saN* is called *dhātu* by P. 3.1.32.

6. The *KV* explains that *ātm.* endings have already been prescribed for *jñā-* (by P. 1.3.44–46) in the sense of denial, when used intransitively and when preceded by *sam* or *prati*; and for *śru-* and *dṛś-* (by P. 1.3.29) when preceded by *sam*. Moreover, by P. 1.3.62 the *ātm.* endings are prescribed for a desiderative verbal base when the primitive base already takes the *ātm.* endings. We must therefore understand that the present rule enlarges the scope of the *ātm.* endings in the case of *jñā-* and *śru-*, but that it states a new prescription in the case of *smṛ-*.

7. The examples provided by the *KV* are *dharmaṃ jijñāsate* 'he desires to know *dharma*', *guruṃ śuśrūṣate* 'he desires to listen to the guru', *naṣṭaṃ susmūrṣate* 'he desires to remember what was lost/the lost one' and *nṛpaṃ didṛkṣate* 'he desires to see the king'.

The derivation of *didṛkṣate* is as follows :

(1)	*dṛśIR*	*Dhātup.* 1.1037
(2)	*dṛś* + *saN*	P. 3.1.7,
(3)	*dṛś* + *dṛś* + *sa*	P. 6.1.9

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

(4) *darś* + *dṛś* + *sa* P. 7.4.66; 1.1.51
(5) *da* + *dṛś* + *sa* P. 7.4.60,
(6) *di* + *dṛś* + *sa* P. 7.4.79

In this stage *guṇa* of the verbal base vowel by P. 7.3.84, is prohibited by P. 1.2.10.

(7) *di* + *drś* + *sa* + *lAṬ* P. 3.1.32; 3.2.123
(8) *di* + *dṛś* + *sa* + *ta* P. 3.4.78
(9) *di* + *dṛś* + *sa* + *te* P. 3.4.79
(10) *di* + *dṛś* + *sa* + *ŚaP* + *te* P. 3.1.68
(11) *di* + *dṛś* + *sa* + *te* P. 6.1.97
(12) *di* + *dṛṣ* + *sa* + *te* P. 8.2.36
(13) *di* + *dṛk* + *sa* + *te* P. 8.2.41
(14) *di* + *dṛk* + *sa* + *te* P. 8.3.59
didṛkṣate.

In *susmūrṣate* the *u*-substitution of the verbal base vowel and its lengthening are applied by P. 7.1.102 and 6.4.16. The essential points of the derivations have been stated by the *Nyāsa* here.

1.3.58 NĀNOR JÑAḤ '(the *ātm.* endings in the sense of *kartṛ* " agent " are) not (added immediately after the desiderative suffix *saN* added) after (the verbal base) *jñā-* " to know " preceded by (the preverb) *anu* '.

1. This is a *pratiṣedhasūtra*. It lays down a prohibition of what was prescribed by the immediately preceding rule. The prohibition concerns the use of the *ātm.* endings in a given case. Thereby P. 1.3.58 becomes an exception to P. 1.3.57.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* ' after a verbal base ' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *sanaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.57.

3. The *uddeśya* is *anoḥ* (*dhātoḥ*) *jñaḥ sanaḥ*. The *vidheya* is *na kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya jñāśrusmṛdṛṣām* is automatically cancelled. Compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271. convedtion 4.

4. The *KV* takes *jñaḥ* as a technical ablative and interprets *sanaḥ* as *sannantāt* '(after *jñā-*) ending in *saN*', by P. 1.1.72. In the translation adopted above the pattern shown in P. 1.3.57 is followed. See P. 1.3.57, sub 4.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The interpretation of the *KV* and the translation stated above amount to the same.

5. For the form *jñaḥ* see P. 1.3.44, sub 4.

6. Kātyāyana has phrased three *vārttikas* on the present rule. *Vt.* I says that the word *sakarmakāt* '(after *jñā-* followed by *saN* and preceded by *anu*) when used transitively ' should be added to the prohibition. The example provided by Patañjali is *auṣadhasyānujijñāsate-* 'he desires to proceed with the help of a medicine ' (translation according to Kaiyaṭa on *Bh.* 1 on p. 1.3.58) The genitive is used by P. 2.3.51.

Vt. II rejects *Vt.* I by referring to P. 1.3.62. According to this rule, the desiderative base follows the primitive base, when the question is of *ātm.* endings. The rule which prescribes the *ātm.* endings for the primitive base *jñā-* is P. 1.3.45. It says that *jñā-* takes the *ātm.* endings when used intransitively. We may therefore infer that the primitive base *jñā-* takes *parasmaipada* endings when used transitively. That goes for the desiderative base *jñā-* also, by P. 1.3.62. Therefore it is not necessary to add the word *sakarmakāt* to P. 1.3.58.

Vt. III provides another solution. It says that the prohibition stated by P. 1.3.58 concerns the immediately preceding rule. This is axiomatic. Patañjali states the relevant *paribhāṣā* (*Mbh.* I, p. 284, line 22; see *PN, pb.* 61). But P. 1.3.57 deals with *jñā-* when used transitively. How do we know that ? Because there is no point in prescribing the *ātm.* endings for an intransitive desiderative base *jñā-* (*Mbh.* I, p. 285, lines 1–2). Therefore the prohibition stated by P. 1.3.58 must also deal with the transitive desiderative base *jñā-*, and there is no need to add the word *sakarmakāt* here.

7. The *KV* repeats the argument of *Vt.* III and provides the example *putram anujijñāsati* 'he desires to know about his son '.

The counterexample for *anu* in the rule provided by the *KV* is *dharmaṃ jijñāsate* ' he desires to know dharma '.

1.3.59 PRATYĀṄBHYĀṂ ŚRUVAḤ (the *ātm.* endings in the sense of *kartṛ* " agent " are not added immediately after the desiderative suffix *saN* added) after (the verbal base) *śru-* " to hear " preceded by (the preverb) *prati* or *āṄ* '

1. The is a *pratiṣedhasūtra.* The prohibition concerns the use of the *ātm.* endings in the case given. Thereby P. 1.3,59. becomes another exception to P. 1.3.57.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *sanaḥ* is continued from p. 1.3.57, and so is *na*.

3. The *uddeśya* is *pratyāṅbhyām* (*dhātoḥ*) *śruvaḥ* (*sanaḥ*). The *vidheya* is *na kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya anor jñaḥ* is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

The negative particle *na* is continued in the present rule on the basis of *sāmarthya*. See Joshi-Bhate 1984, P. 274, convention 39.

4. The *KV* takes *śruvaḥ* as a technical ablative and interprets *sanaḥ* as *sannantāt* '(after *śru-*) ending in *saN*', by P. 1.1.72. In the translation adopted above the pattern shown in P. 1.3.57 is followed. See P. 1.3.57 sub 4. The interpretation of the *KV* and the translation amount to the same.

According to the *Nyāsa* here *śruvaḥ* is a genitive in the sense of a qualifier-qualified relation. The relation is construed as follows, *śṛṇoter yau viśeṣaṇabhūtau pratyāṅau tatpūrvāc cchruvaḥ sambandhād sannantāt ātmanepadaṃ na bhavati* 'after *śru-* preceded by *prati* or *āN*' which function as qualifiers of (the base quoted as) *śṛṇoti* "to hear" (and) which ends in *saN* on account of the connection (between *śru-* and *saN*) the *ātm.* endings are not added'. Thus, whereas according to the Nyāsa, a genitive relation holds between *pratyāṅbhyāṃ* and *śruvaḥ*, in the translation adopted above a genitive relation holds between *śruvaḥ* and *sanaḥ*. In both cases, however, *śruvaḥ* is considered to be a genitive.

5. The *KV* explains that by *prati* and *āN* the preverbs *prati* and *āN* are meant, not the identical *post-* positions. For *āN* compare P. 1.3.21 (a) sub 6.

For the dual. abl. ending *-bhyām* compare P. 1.3.10, sub 4 (on P. 2.3.5).

6. In the form *śruvaḥ* the augment *uvaN* is applied by P. 6.4.77.

7. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *pratiśuśruṣati* 'he wishes to promise' and *āśuśruṣati* 'he wishes to call out'.

The counterexample for *prati* (and *āN*) as preverbs provided by the *KV* is *devadattaṃ prati śuśruṣate* 'he wishes to listen to Devadatta'.

8. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.3.60 ŚADEḤ ŚITAḤ '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after (the verbal base) *śad-* "to fall down", when (subsequently a *vikaraṇa*) marked with *Ś* (will be added)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ*) *śadeḥ śitaḥ*. The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya śruvaḥ* is automatically cancelled. Compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

The word *pratyāṅbhyām* from P. 1.3.59 is discontinued on the basis of *sāmarthya*, that is, because it doesn't make sense in the present rule. So are the words *sanaḥ* and *na* from P. 1.3.57 and 59 respectively.

4. The *KV* takes *śadeḥ* as a technical ablative (P. 1.1.67) and offers two explanations for *śitaḥ*. The first is *śadir yaḥ śit* (i. e.) *śidbhāvī tasmāt* 'after that (base) *śad-* which is *Śit* (that is,) which will become *Śit* "marked with *Ś*" (after a *Śit vikaraṇa* has been added)'. The second is *śadir yaḥ śitaḥ sambandhī tasmāt* 'after that (base) *śad-* which is the correlative of (a *vikaraṇa*) marked with *Ś*'. In the first interpretation *śitaḥ* is taken as a technical ablative. In the second interpretation *śitaḥ* is taken as a non-technical genitive.

The translation adopted above follows the first interpretation of the *KV*. Here *śitaḥ* functions as a qualifier of *śadeḥ*.

5. The verbal base *śadḶ* is mentioned in the sense of *śātana* 'cutting off' in the *Dhātup.* 1.908 and 6.134. For the function of the *anubandha Ḷ* see P. 3.1.55. By P. 7.3.78 *śīy* is substituted for *śad* when a *Śit*-suffix follows (P. 7.1.75).

Śadi is the quotation form of *śad-* by *Vt.* II on P. 3.3.108.

6. Kātyāyana has phrased five *vārttikas* on the present rule. *Vt.* I says that, since the addition of a *Śit vikaraṇa* after *śad-* is dependent on the presence of *parasmaipada* endings (reference is to P. 3.1.67–68 and P. 1.3.78 as the general rule for finite verb endings), the question of adding *ātm.* endings does not arise. Then how to justify P. 1.3.60 ?

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vt. II says that we can manage by prescribing the *ātm.* endings as substitutes for *lAṬ* in the case of *śad–*. Hereby the *ātm.* endings (not the *parasmaipada* endings) are introduced first, then the *Śit vikaraṇa* is introduced. But in that case we have to change the rule P. 1.3.60. Patañjali prefers to leave the rule as it is (*Mbh.* I, p. 285, line 16). Then how to interpret it ? Patañjali offers three solutions, as follows :

a. *Śitaḥ* is a genitive indicating relation in general. Thus the rule comes to mean ' after *śad-* which is connected with a *Śit vikaraṇa.* That is to say, ' after *Śad–* which is the verbal base of the *Śit vikaraṇa* '. (*Mbh.* I, p. 285, line 18). In this case, the *ātm.* endings are introduced first, then the *Śit vikaraṇa.* This is the second interpretation offered by the *KV.*

b. *Śitaḥ* is an ablative. It serves as a qualifier of *śadeḥ* : after that base *śad–* which is *Śit.* But since there is no *śad–* marked with Ś, we will understand *śadeḥ śitaḥ* to mean ' after *śad–* which forms the domain of a *Śit vikaraṇa* ' That is to say, after *śad–* after which a *Śit vikaraṇa* will be added (*Mbh.* I, p. 285, lines 19–20). In this case, the *ātm.* ending is introduced first, then the *Śit vikaraṇa.* This is the first interpretation offered by the *KV.*

c. *Śitaḥ* is an ablative again. P. 1.3.60 is a restrictive rule (*niyama*). Out of the possible *parasmaipada* and *ātm.* endings it prescribes the *ātm.* endings only. Therefore, by the maxim *vikaraṇebhyo niyamo balīyān* ' a restrictive rule is stronger than (rules prescribing) *vikaraṇas* ' (compare *Mbh.* I, p. 274, line 11; *PN. pb.* 41) we may think that the *ātm.* endings are added first, and the *Śit-vikaraṇa* only later on.

But, according to Patañjali, in connection with *śad–*, the *Śit–vikaraṇa* is the basis for adding the *ātm-* endings (*Mbh.* I, p. 285, lines 20–21). Or, as explained by Kaiyaṭa here, the *Śit vikaraṇa* is added first on the strength of the rule, that is, because otherwise the rule would be futile. Thus the rule is taken to mean that only *ātm.* endings are added to *śad–* when a *Śit vikaraṇa* has been added first. Here *śadeḥ śitaḥ* is interpreted as *śadeḥ śidantāt* ' after *śad–* ending in a *Śit–vikaraṇa* '.

According to this last interpretation, which is Patañjali's preferred interpretation, the order of application of the rules concerned is as follows :

(1) The *Śit–vikaraṇa* rule is applied first, against P. 1.3.67-68 which clearly state that the *vikaraṇa* is conditioned by a *sārvadhātuka* suffix; and against the maxim *vikaraṇebhyo niyamo balīyān* mentioned by Patañjali here. That gives us

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

śad + ŚaP

(2) The *ātm.* ending is added subsequently. That gives us

śad + śaP + te

Vts III–V really belong to P. 1.3.17–18. They are concerned with the immediate sequence of an *upasarga* and a verbal base, as is clear from Patañjali's examples, and with the question of rule-ordering in the case of *vikaraṇas*. It is revealing that the *Śabdakaustubha* (*Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series*, Vol. II, Benares 1929, p. 65) deals with these *Vts* under P. 1.3.17 while referring to P. 1.3.60. On the other hand, the rule P. 1.3.60 is dispatched in four lines by the *Śabdakaustubha* (p. 78). Therefore, what figures as *Vts* III–V and the *bhāṣya* thereon in the present edition of the *Mbh.* text should really be *Vts* I–III and the *bhāṣya* on P. 1.3.17–18.

Vt. III says that when the question is of a restrictive rule concerning a verbal base preceded by a preverb an addition is to be made to accommodate the intervention of the augment *aṬ*. The examples provided by Patañjali are *nyaviśata* 'he entered' and *vyakrīṇīta* 'he sold' (*Mbh.* I, p. 285, line 18). Reference is to P. 1.3.17 and to P. 1.3.18. These two rules prescribe the *ātm.* endings for *viś-* when preceded by *ni* and for *krī-* when preceded by *vi*. The problem is that of the immediate sequence of the preverbs and the verbal bases concerned which is presupposed by the two rules. If, however, the augment intervenes between the preverb and the verbal base, the immediate sequence is lost. Consequently, we cannot add the *ātm.* endings any more, which is not desired. The point of *Vt.* III is that even if an augment intervenes, the scope of the rules concerned (P. 1.3.17 and 18) is widened so as to include this case of intervention by an augment also.

In the *bhāṣya* the objection is made that the augment is considered part of the verbal base (*dhātubhakta*), and that therefore the whole consisting of augment and verbal base can be covered by the designation *dhātu* (Mbh. I p. 285, lines 24–25). Apparently, reference is to what was to become *PN*, *pb.* 11. But Patañjali thinks that the augment is part, not of the *dhātu*, but of the *aṅga* '(verbal) stem, because the rule prescribing the augment (P. 6.4.71) comes under P. 6.4.1, *aṅgasya*, and here the *aṅga*, according to Patañjali's last interpretation of P. 1.3.60, ends in a *Śit-vikaraṇa* (*Mbh.* I, p. 285, line 25).

Here, to Patañjali's opinion a series of conflicts start. A conflict arises when two rules become simultaneously applicable to one and the same linguistic item and we cannot apply them together. In such a case a procedure has to be developed which determines precedence. See *AP* I, p. 97–98. The

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

first conflict, according to Patañjali, is that between the rule prescribing the augment *aṬ* and the rule prescribing the *Śit vikaraṇa*. Which rule is to be applied first ? As Patañjali sees it, this conflict is solved by having recourse to *nityatva* (*Mbh.* I, p. 286, lines 4–5). Patañjali defines a rule as *anitya*, if it remains applicable after the linguistic form (*śabda* to which it was to apply) has become changed due to the operation of the other rule (*Mbh.* I, p. 286, line 5). Therefore, in relation to the *Śit–vikaraṇa* rule, the augment rule is *anitya*. Or, to put it the other way round, in relation to the augment rule, the *Śit–vikaraṇa* rule is *nitya*. Being *nitya*, it prevails. That is why the *Śit–vikaraṇa* is introduced before the augment is introdnced.

Put in slightly more modern terminology, since the *Śit–vikaraṇa* rule changes the linguistic environment in which the augment rule was to become applicable, it is *siddha* in relation to the augment rule. Being *siddha* it prevails. See further Joshi–Roodbergen 1987, p. 544.

The second conflict, according to Patañjali, is that between the augment rule and the rule prescribing the *lA*–substitute, that is, the finite verb ending, in fact, the *ātm.* ending. That conflict too is decided, according to Patañjali, by having recourse to *nityatva*. In relation to the rule prescribing the *lA*–substitute the augment rule is *anitya*. Or, to put it differently, in relation to the augment rule the *lA*–substitute rule is *nitya*. That is why the *lA*–substitute is introduced before the augment (*Mbh.* I, p. 286, lines 7–8).

The conclnsion of Patañjali's discussion of *Vt.* III so far must be that this *Vt.* is not required, because we can manage by applying grammatical principles.

Vt. IV is an *iti cet–vārttika*. It contains an argument by way of supposition and its refutation. Suppose it is argued that the *ātm.* ending is introduced before the augment on the ground that a *lA*–substitute is *nitya*, whereas the augment rule is not. Then this argument is refuted by saying that the augment rule also has a cause of application which is *nitya*. Thus here, according to the *Vārttikakāra*, we have an instance of what may be called a two–way conflict (see Joshi–Roodbergen 1987, p. 542; *AP* I, P. 98). The consequence is that the *ātm.* endings cannot be applied at all.

Then how to have these endings which are desired ? *Vt.* V says that it is precisely for that reason that *Vt.* III is required.

Patañjali denies this (*Mbh.* I, P. 286, line 15). He thinks that we can manage by the *antaraṅga*–principle. According to Patañjali, the *lA*–substitute rule is *antaraṅga* ' whose cause of application comes earlier (than that of

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

another rule) given a particular linguistic sequence '. Here the other rule is (a) the rule prescribing the *Śit–vikaraṇa*, (b) the augment rule and (c) the restrictive rules P. 1.3.17–18 prescribing an *ātm.* ending (Mbh. I, p. 286, lines 16–17). Thus, according to Patañjali, the correct order of application of rules in the case of *nyaviśata* ' he entered ' should be as follows :

(1)			*viś–*					*Dhātup.* 6.130
(2)	*ni*		+ *viś*					
(3)	*ni*		+ *viś*			+ *laṄ*		P. 3.2.111
(4)	*ni*		+ *viś*			+ *ta*		P. 3.4.78
(5)	*ni*		+ *viś*	+ *ŚaP*		+ *ta*		P. 3.1.68
(6)	*ni*	+ *aṬ*	+ *viś*	+ *a*		+ *ta*		P. 6.4.71
(7)	*ny*	+ *a*	+ *viś*	+ *a*		+ *ta*		P. 6.1.77
	nyaviśata.							

Patañjali is remarkably wrong on several accounts, especially in thinking that the *Śit–vikaraṇa* is to be introduced before the *ātm.* ending. Let us have a look again at the derivation of *nyaviśata*. It should go like this :

(3)	*ni*		+ *viś*		+ *lAṄ*		P. 3.2.111
(4)	*ni*	+ *aṬ*	+ *viś*		+ *lAṄ*		P. 6.4.71
(5)	*ni*	+ *a*	+ *viś*		+ *ta*		P. 3.4.78
(6)	*ni*	+ *a*	+ *viś*	+ *ŚaP*	+ *ta*		P. 3.1.68
(7)	*ny*	+ *a*	+ *viś*	+ *a*	+ *ta*		P. 6.1.77
	nyaviśata.						

We note the following :

a. In stage (4) the augment *aṬ* is introduced because it is conditioned by *lAṄ*. Before the *lakāra lAṄ* the base *viś–* is termed *aṅga* by P. 1.4.13. Therefore the augment rule which comes in the section headed by P. 6.4.1 can be introduced without difficulty. It could even be introduced in a later stage, because the property *lAṄ–tva* belongs to the finite verb ending by *sthānivadbhāva.*

b. In stage (5) the *ātm.* ending is introduced. This is possible because the whole of (*ni* +) *aṬ* + *viś* is covered by the designation *dhātu*, by *PN*, *pb.* 11. Therefore the question of a conflict between the augment rule and the rule prescribing the *ātm.* ending does not arise.

c. In stage (6) *Śit–vikaraṇa ŚaP* is introduced. The question of conflict between the rule prescribing the *Śit–vikaraṇa* and the rule prescribing the *ātm.* ending does not arise, because the addition of the *vikaraṇa* is clearly conditioned by the presence of a *sārvadhātuka* suffix (P. 3.1.67–68).

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

d. As regards Patañjali's appeal to *antaraṅgatva*, this is incorrect, because the *antaraṅga-pb.* is not to be applied word-internally. See Joshi-Kiparski 1979, p. 235, 236.

e. The maxim *vikaraṇebhyo niyamo balīyān* invoked by Patañjali (see *PN, pb.* 41) is based on P. 1.3.92. This is Nāgeśa's explanation. P. 1.3.92 is concerned with the *vikaraṇa sya* used in the formation of future or conditional finite verbs. This *vikaruṇa* is not a *Śit-vikaraṇa*. Then how can Patañjali have recourse to this *paribhāṣā* in the context of *Śit-vikaraṇas* ?

Another question is, how to justify Patañjali ? His assumption may have been that by the general rule P. 3.4.78 all 18 finite verb endings are added. As soon as they are added, the difficulty of adding the *vikaraṇa ŚaP* and of the restriction regarding the finite verb endings arises. In this situation the *vikaraṇas* are *nitya*, that is, *siddha*, with regard to the verb endings. Consequently, the *ātm.* endings cannot be added. For the idea of adding all 18 finite verb endings, compare Nāgeśa on *PN, pb.* 41, text, p. 73, lines 1-4. But the idea seems fanciful.

Two conclusions follow :

1. *Vt.* III and *Vts* IV-V are not required because we can manage by *PN, pb.* 11

2. Patañjali's conflicts are artificial. They started from the supposition that the *Śit-Vikaraṇa* is to be introduced before the *ātm.* ending is introduced, and they vanish like a (bad) dream. But as regards the precedence relation between *vikaraṇas* and finite verb endings Skt. grammatical tradition remains ambiguous. See Roodbergen 1991, p. 293-5.

7. The examples provided by the *KV* are *śīyate* ' he falls down ', *śīyete* ' the two of them fall down ' and *śīyante* ' they fall down '.

The counterexamples for the condition *śitaḥ* provided by the *KV* are *aśatsyat* ' he was going to fall down '. *śatsyati* ' he will fall down ' and *śiśatsati* ' he desires to fall down ' (*Mbh.* I, p. 287, line 21). The suffixes added after *śad-* here are none of them *Śit-vikaraṇas*. For the substitution of *t* for the *d* of *śad-* apply P. 8.4.55.

1.3.61 (a) MRIYATEḤ ' (the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* " agent ") immediately after (the verbal base) *mṛ-* " to die " (when subsequently a *vikaraṇa* marked with *Ś* will be added). '

1. The rule translated here is not P. 1.3.61 in its traditional wording. We propose to divide the rule into two, as follows :

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

(a) *mriyateḥ*,

(b) *luṅliṅoś ca*

The reasons for doing so are identical with the reasons stated under P. 1.3.21 (a), sub 1.

2. The function assigned to *ca* in P. 1.3.61 by the *KV* is to ensure the continuation of *śitaḥ* from P. 1.3.60. Thus, as far as this continuation is concerned, there is no difference between the traditional interpretation of P. 1.3.61 and the proposal stated above, as far as *śitaḥ* is concerned.

3. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

4. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* ' after a verbal base ' see P. 1.3.12. sub 3. The word *śitaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.60.

5. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ*) *mriyateḥ* (*śitaḥ*). The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya śadeḥ* is automatically discontinued. compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, P. 271, convention 4. The discontinuation of the (part-) *uddeśya śadeḥ* does not imply the automatic discontinuation of its qualifier *śitaḥ*, since *śitaḥ* is compatible with the new (part-) *uddeśya mriyateḥ*. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 5.

6. The form *mriyati* is the quotation form of *mṛ–*, by *Vt.* II on P.3.3.108. The verbal base *mṛ–* is quoted as *mṛṄ prāṇatyāge* ' *mṛ–* in the sense of breathe one's last ' in the *Dhātup.* 6.110. The *anubandha Ṅ* indicates that *mṛ–* takes *ātm.* endings by P. 1.3.12. According to the present rule, the *ātm.* endings are added only when a *Śit–vikaraṇa* follows. Thus P. 1.3.61 (a) has the character of a *niyama* ' restrictive rule '.

7. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the traditional rule P. 1.3.61.

8. The examples provided by the *KV* are *mriyate* ' he dies ', *mriyete* ' the two of them die ' and *mriyante* ' they die '.

The derivation of *mriyate* is as follows :

(1) *mṛṄ̃*		*Dhātup.* 6.110
(2) *mṛ*	+ *laṬ*	P. 3.2.123
(3) *mṛ*	+ *ta*	P. 3.4.78
(4) *mṛ*	+ *Śa* + *ta*	P. 3.1.77
(5) *mri*	+ *a* + *ta*	P. 7.4.28
(6) *mriy*	+ *a* + *ta*	P. 6.4.77
(7) *mriy*	+ *a* + *te*	P. 3.4.79
mriyate.		

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Guṇa is not applied to the verbal base vowel because the *vikaraṇa Śa* is *Ṅit* by P. 1.2.4. Therefore P. 1.1.5 applies.

The counterexamples for the *niyama*- character of P. 1.3.61 (a) provided by the *KV* are *mariṣyati* 'he will die' and *amariṣyat* 'he was going to die'.

1.3.61 (b) LUṄLIṄOŚ CA '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after the verbal base *mṛ*- "to die") when *lUṄ* or *lIṄ* follows'.

1. For the proposed division of the traditional rule see P. 1.3.61 (a), sub 1.

2. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

3. *Ca*, being a multi-purpose word in the A., has two functions in the present rule. First, it marks off this rule from P. 1.3.61 (a). Secondly, it connects the present rule by way of associative digression with the topic of the previous rule, namely, the addition of *ātm.* endings after *mṛ*-. A *vidheya* which is introduced as an associative digression by means of *ca* is not continued in a following rule. See Joshi-Bhate 1984, P. 99.

4. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *mriyateḥ* is continued from p. 1.3.61, (a).

5. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ mriyateḥ*) *luṅliṅos*. The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam*. The qualifier *śitaḥ* ftom P. 1.3.61 (a) has been cancelled because it is incompatible with *luṅliṅoḥ*. See Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271. convention 5.

6. *LUṄ* is the aor. marker, by P. 3.2.110 and 3.2.84. By *lIṄ* is meant *āśirliṅ*, Whitney's precative (paras 567 and 573 c. in his *Sanskrit Grammar*). The *sūtra* concerned is P. 3.3.173. What is expressed is a wish, desire, or a benediction.

7. The examples for *lUṄ* provided by the *KV* is *amṛta* 'he died'. According to Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, para. 834 a., *ātm.* forms like *amṛta* belong to the root-aor. mostly or altogether, although grammarians treat them as belonging to the s-aor. As a matter of fact, a root-aor. is not known to Pāṇini. Everywhere, with the exception of causatives and three specifically mentioned verbal bases, the suffix *cli* is replaced by *sIC* (P. 3.1.48; 3.1.43-44). Thus in the stage *a* + *mṛ* + *sIC* + *lUṄ* the *s* of *sIC* is deleted by

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

P. 8.2.27. *SIC* is *Kit* by P. 1.2.12. Therefore *guṇa* of the verbal base vowel is prohibited by P. 1.1.5.

In the case of verbal bases in *ā* like *dā-*, the *s* is deleted by P. 2.4.77.

The example for (*āśir*) *lIṄ* provided by the *KV* is *mṛṣīṣṭa* ' may he die '. According to Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, para. 925 b. the precative middle is virtually unkuown in the whole later language, not a single occurrence of it having been brought to light.

The derivation of *mṛṣīṣṭ* is as follows :

(1)	*mṛṄ*				*Dhātup.* 6.110
(2)	*mṛ*			+ *lIṄ*	P. 3.3.173
(3)	*mṛ*	+ *SīyUṬ* +		+ *lIṄ*	P. 3.4.102
(4)	*mṛ*	+ *sīy*	+ *sUṬ*	+ *lIṄ*	P. 3.4.107
(5)	*mṛ*	+ *siy*	+ *s*	+ *ta*	P. 3.4.78; 3.4.116
(6)	*mṛ*	+ *si*	+ *s*	+ *ta*	P. 6.1.66
(7)	*mṛ*	+ *ṣi*	+ *s*	+ *ta*	P. 8.3.59
(8)	*mṛ*	+ *ṣi*	+ *ṣ*	+ *ta*	P. 8.3.59
(9)	*mṛ*	+ *ṣi*	+ *ṣ*	+ *ṭa*	P. 8.4.41
	mṛṣīṣṭa				

Guṇa of the verbal base vowel by P. 7.3 84 has been prohibited by P. 1.2.12. Because the precative endings are *ārdhadhātuka* by P. 3.4.116, no *vikaraṇa* is added.

1.3.62 PŪRVAVAT SANAḤ ' (the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* " agent " immediately after a verbal base) which ends in (the desiderative suffix) *saN* in the same manner as (to the verbal base) which precedes (that suffix *saN*) '

1. This is an *atideśasūtra*, a rule of transferred application, because it contains a word ending in the suffix *vatI* (P. 5.1.115) denoting similarity of action. What is transferred is the addition of *ātm.* endings, namely, from the non-desiderative base to the desiderative base. For the term *atideśa* see *ATA*, p. 3, fn. 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* ' after a verbal base ' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ*) *sanaḥ*. The *vidheya* is (*sanaḥ*) *pūrvavat kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* the previous *uddeśya* is automatically cancelled. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, P. 271, convention 4.

4. In the translation adopted above the rule is interpreted as reading *sanaḥ pūrvavat sanaḥ*. Here two words *sanaḥ* are assumed, the first indicative of the exact reference or the limit (*avadhi*) of *pūrva*, and the second to be interpreted as *sannantāt* by P. 1.1.72. The non–mention of one of two identical words is due to *sūtra*–style.

The interpretation stated above is virtually that of the *KV* (repeated in the *SK*, No. 2734 on P. 1.3.62). Thus the rule comes to mean that if the non–desiderative base takes *ātm.* endings, the desiderative base will also take *ātm.* endings.

5. The word *pūrvavat* occurs twice in the A. The other occurrence is in P. 2.4.27. Here *pūrva* refers to the preceding constituent in a cp., that is to a preceding linguistic unit, as the case in P. 1.3.62 in the translation adopted above. Out of 62 occurrences of the word *pūrva* in the A. whether as an independent word or as a cp. constituent, checked from Böhtlingk's word–index on the A., the overwhelming majority refers to a preceding linguistic item. Not a single occurrence has been found in which *pūrva* is used to refer to a preceding rule.

The *KV* explains both the sense of the suffix *vat* and the construction of the word *pūrva* by saying *yena nimittena pūrvasmād ātmanepadaṃ vidhīyate tenaiva sannantād api bhavati* ' the *ātm.* endings are added after (a verbal base)' ending in *saN* also, by precisely the same cause (of application) by which they are prescribed after the preceding (non–*sannanta*) form (of the base)'. Here the use of the instrumental (*yena nimittena... tena*) is in accordance with P. 5.1.115 which prescribes the suffix *vati* after a word in the instrumental case when the sense is that of similarity of action. Here the action consists in adding the *ātm.* endings. The ablative form *pūrvasmāt*, on the other hand, is used in its technical sense to indicate after which item the *ātm.* endings are to be added, namely, the item which precedes the suffix *saN*, that is the primitive base.

6. Once the rule has been interpreted as above (see also under 5), the *Vts* I and II on the rule and the *bhāṣya* on these *Vts* become rather pointless. Before introducing these *Vts* Patañjali discusses the reference of the word *pūrva* in the rule. There are two possibilities. It may be taken to refer to the

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

verbal base preceding *saN*, or it may be taken to refer to rules stated before P. 1.3.62, notably the rules P. 1.3.58–61.

Vts I and II are concerned with the second alternative which leads nowhere. In his *bhāṣya* on *Vt.* II Patañjali reproduces a passage which is identical with his *bhāṣya* on (*śloka*) *vārttika* VI on P. 1.1.57, for which see *STHANI*, Pt. I, p. 233. Patañjali's discussion here also leads nowhere.

Vt. III is an *iti cet–vārttika*. Here it contains an argument by way of supposition, and a consequence following from it. Suppose it is argued that *ātm.* endings are added after *sannanta* bases by seeing that they are added after the non-*sannanta* base Then, in that case, we cannot justify them after the bases *gup-* etc. Patañjali provides the examples *jugupsate* 'he feels disgust' and *mīmāṃsate* 'he examines' (*Mbh.* I, p. 288, line 11). According to P. 3.1.5 and 6, the suffix *saN* is added after *gup-* etc. and after *mān-* to convey a particular, non-desiderative meaning. When conveying this meaning the verbal bases concerned are never without *saN*. Then how to know that the *ātm.* endings are to be added ?

Vt. IV provides a solution. It says, we can manage by *liṅgātideśa* 'transference of the marker'. Which marker ? Reference is to the marker *A* added to *gup-* in the *Dhātup.* (1.1019). This *A* is *anudātta*. P. 1.3.12 tells us that verbal bases marked with an *anudātta* vowel take *ātm.* endings. That marker is to be transferred to the *sannanta* base *gup-*. Consequently, the base *jugupsa–* will take *ātm.* endings. The same holds for *mān-* noted down as *mānA* in the *Dhātup.* (1.1021)

Vt. V says that, on the supposition of *liṅgātideśa*, we have to phrase a prohibition of such transference in the case of *kṛñādi* verbs. Reference is to the verbal base *kṛ-*, noted down as *ḌUkṛÑ* in the *Dhātup.* (8.10). Patañjali provides the examples *anucikīrṣati* 'he desires to imitate' and *parācikīrṣatī* 'he desires to reject' (*Mbh.* I, p. 288, line 26). The point is that the base *kṛ-* has been marked with *Ñ*. Therefore it takes the *ātm.* endings in the sense of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* 'the result of the action being intended to benefit the agent', by P. 1.3.72. But the special rule P. 1.3.79 stipulates that *kṛ-* preceded by *anu* or *parā* takes the *parasmaipada* endings, even in the sense of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale*. Now, if *liṅgātideśa* takes place from *kṛÑ*, whether or not preceded by *anu* or *parā*, to *cikīrṣa-*, we can have *ātm.* endings only. This is not desired. Therefore a prohibition has to be phrased.

Patañjali accepts all three *Vts*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vt. VI says that mention should be made (in P. 1.3.62) of the term *pratyaya* 'suffix' so that verb formations with *ṆNi* and *yak* can be accommodated. Thus, according to Kātyāyana, the scope of the rule should be widened by reading it as *pūrvavat pratyayāt* instead of *pūrvavat sanaḥ*. Patañjali provides the examples *ākusmayate|vikusmayate* 'he smiles contemptuously', *hṛṇīyate* 'he is angry/ashamed' and *mahīyate* 'he is honoured'. The verbal base *kusmay-* is mentioned in the *Dhātup.* 10.171 (*kusmA*) and is only attested in grammatical literature. Here the suffix *ṆiC* is added by P. 3.1.25. But we wouldn't know that the form ending in *ṆiC* takes the *ātm.* endings just like the non-*ṇijanta* form except by the present *Vt. Hṛṇīyate* is a *yak*-derivation by P. 3.1.27. It is attested in the Ṛgveda 5.2.8 and in the *Naiṣadhīya* 1.133. *Mahīyate* is also a *yaK*-derivation by P. 3.1.27. It is widely attested from the Ṛgveda onwards, in Brāhmaṇa and in Upaniṣadic literature, e. g. *Chānd. Up.* 8.1.1; 8.2.1 and *Kaṭhop.* 2.17. Obviously, there is no way of knowing whether these latter two denominatives take *ātm.* endings except by the present *Vt.*

Vt. VII says that, moreover, a prohibition (of *ātm.* endings) must be phrased for the suffix *ṆiC* added by P. 1.3.26 in the sense of *hetumat* '(the action of) a causing agent'. Patañjali provides the examples *āsayati* 'he causes to sit down' and *śāyayati* 'he causes to lie down' (*Mbh.* I, p. 289, line 14).

Kātyāyana's proposals in *Vts* VI and VII are too much for Patañjali. They imply a change of P. 1.3.62 and additional prohibition. But Pāṇini's rules should not be tampered with, they should remain as they are. Therefore Patañjali rejects the *Vts.* This means that he has to find a different way to justify the forms noted by Kātyāyana. And so he does.

As a matter of fact, Patañjali offers two solutions. The first solution says that the *atm.* endings are added on the strength of the markers which have been added (*Mbh.* I, p. 289, lines 15–16). That is to say, since the primitive bases have been provided with a particular marker in the *Dhātup.*, that marker should hold good for the *sannanta* bases also. The second solution says that a mark introduced in a part becomes a distinctive feature of the whole (*Mbh.* I, p. 289, line 16), just as a mark put on the thigh or ear of cattle becomes distinctive of the whole animal (*Mbh.* I, p. 289, line 17). In the same way, the marker added in the *Dhātup.* to the primitive base becomes a distinctive feature of the *sannanta* base of which the primitive base forms a part. Then why are the *atm.* endings not added to the causatives *hṛṇīyayati* 'he causes to be angry' and *mahīyayati* 'he causes to be honoured' (*Mbh.* I, p. 289, line 18)? The reason is simple: the distinctive feature belongs to that

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

whole which is never without the part marked with that feature. In forms like *hṛṇīyayati* and *mahīyayati* the *yaK*-part is invariably connected with *hṛṇī-* and *mahī-*, but the *ṆiC*-part is not. A mark put on a piece of cattle is distinctive of that particular animal only, not of the whole herd (*Mbh.* I, p. 289, line 21).

7. The examples provided by the *KV* fall into three groups, depending on the cause by which the verbal bases concerned take the *ātm.* endings, as follows :

a. *āsisiṣate* ' he desires to sit ', *śiśayiṣate* ' he desires to lie down '. Since the bases *ās-* (*Dhātup.* 2.11) and *śī-* (*Dhātup.* 2.22) have been marked with an *anudātta* vowel and with *Ñ* respectively and therefore take the *ātm.* endings by P. 1.3.12, the corresponding *sannanta* bases do the same.

b. *niviviśate* ' he desires to enter '. The base *niviś-* takes the *ātm.* endings by P. 1.3.17. Therefore the corresponding *sannanta* base does also.

c. *ācikraṃsate* ' he desires to ascend '. The base *ākram-* takes the *ātm.* endings by P. 1.3.40. Therefore the corresponding *sannanta* base does also.

By way of example, the derivation of *ācikraṃsate* is as follows :

(1)	+ *kramU*	*Dhātup.* 4.98
(2) *ā*	+ *kram*	
(3) *ā*	+ *kram* + *saN*	P. 3.1.7
(4) *ā* + *kram*	+ *kram* + *sa*	P. 6 1.9
(5) *ā* + *kram*	+ *kram* + *sa* + *lAṬ*	P. 3.2.123
(6) *ā* + *kram*	+ *kram* + *sa* + *ta*	P. 3.4.78
(7) *ā* + *kram*	+ *kram* + *sa* + *ŚaP* + *ta*	P. 3.1.68
(8) *ā* + *ka*	+ *kram* + *sa* + *a* + *ta*	P. 7.4.60
(9) *ā* + *ki*	+ *kram* + *sa* + *a* + *ta*	P. 7.4.79
(10) *ā* + *ci*	+ *kram* + *sa* + *a* + *ta*	P. 7.4.62
(11) *ā* + *ci*	+ *kram* + *sa* + *ta*	P. 6 1.97
(12) *ā* + *ci*	+ *kram* + *sa* + *te*	P. 3.4.79
(13) *ā* + *ci*	+ *kraṃ* + *sa* + *te*	P. 8.3.24
	ācikraṃsate.	

The counterexamples provided by the *KV* also come in groups as follows :

a. *śiśatsati* ' he desires to fall down ', *mumūrṣati* ' he desires to die '. The bases *śad-* and *mṛ-* take *atm.* endings (by P. 1 3.60 and 61) on the condi-

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

tion that a *Śit-vikaraṇa* will be added. But the desiderative suffix *saN* is not a *Śit-vikaraṇa*. In fact, it is not a *vikaraṇa* at all.

b. *anucikīrṣati* 'he desires to imitate', *parācikīrṣati* 'he desires to reject'. See further under 6. ad *Vt.* V.

c. *jugupsate* 'he feels disgust', *mīmāṃsate* 'he examines'. See further under 6. ad *Vt.* III. For the justification of these forms the *KV* refers to Patañjali's second solution. See under 6. ad *Vts* VI and VII.

The derivation of *mumūrṣati* is as follows :

(1)	*mṛÑ* –		*Dhutup.* 6.110
(2)	*mṛ* + *saN*		P. 3.1.7
(3)	*mur* + *sa*		P. 7.1.102; 1.1.51
(4)	*mur* + *mur* + *sa*		P. 6.1.9
(5)	*mu*° + *mur* + *sa*		P. 7.4.60
(6)	*mu* + *mur* + *sa*	+ *lAṬ*	P. 3.2.123
(7)	*mu* + *mur* + *sa*	+ *ti*	P. 3.4.78
(8)	*mu* + *mur* + *sa* + *ŚaP*	+ *ti*	P. 3.1.68.
(9)	*mu* + *mur* + *sa*	+ *ti*	P. 6.1.97
(10)	*mu* + *mūr* + *sa*	+ *ti*	P. 8.2.77
(11)	*mu* + *mūr* + *ṣa*	+ *ti*	P. 8.3.59

mumūrṣati.

1.3.63 ĀMPRATYAYAVAT KṚÑO 'NUPRAYOGASYA '(the *ātm.* endings in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" are added after the verbal base) *krÑ*– "to do" (when used) as an auxiliary, in the same manner as (the verbal base) after which (the suffix) *ām* is added'

1. Going by the use of the suffix *vat*, P. 1.3.36 is an *atideśasūtra*. See further P. 1.3.62, sub 1. What is transferred is the addition of the *ātm.* endings, namely, from the base to which the suffix *ām*- is added to *kṛ*- functioning as an auxiliary. That is to say, if the *ām*-base takes *ātm.* endings, then *kṛ*- also For the character of the rule see further under 9.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 1.

According to Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 290, line 5) the word *pūrvavat* is, continued from P. 1.3.62 for a special reason. See under 9.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ*) *kṛño 'nuprayogasya*. The *vidheya* is *āmpratyayavat kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* and (part-) *vidheya* the previous *uddeśya sanaḥ* and (part-) *vidheya pūrvavat* are automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

Are *āmpratyayavat* and *pūrvavat* incompatible items ? *Pūrvavat* refers to a preceding linguistic unit. In the case, for instance, of the *sannanta* base *cikīrṣa-* the preceding unit is *kṛ-* which is a verbal base. But in the case of *udumbhāṃ cakāra*, etc. the preceding unit is *udumbhām*, etc. which is not a verbal base. Therefore in P. 1.3.63 a different word from *pūrvavat* is required. That different word is *āmpratyayavat*, that is, *āmpratyayasahitaprakṛtivat* ' in the manner of a verbal base joined with the suffix *ām* '.

4. The *KV* and the *Nyāsa* take *kṛñaḥ* as a genitive, and *anuprayogasya* as a word in apposition. In the translation adopted above, however, *kṛñaḥ* is taken as a technical ablative. See P. 1.3.58, sub 4. This leaves no other way but to interpret *anuprayogasya* as an ablative too. Compare P. 1.3.10, sub 4, on P. 3.2.5.

5. The suffix *ām* referred to is used in the formation of the periphrastic perfect and prescribed by P. 3.1.35-42. Compare Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, para. 1070.

The word *āmpratyaya* is explained by the *KV* as a *bv.* cp. Following the genitive interpretation of *kṛñaḥ* the *Nyāsa* explains the word *āmpratyayavat* as a *taddhita-* formation by P. 5.1.116 (*tasya*). Thus it is taken to mean *āmpratyayasya iva* ' like (a verbal base) to which the suffix *ām* is added (takes *ātm.* endings) '. The better way to explain the *taddhita* formation is by P. 5.1.115. This does not require identical case endings (*kṛñaḥ-āmpratyayasya*), but use of *iva* does. In any case, Pāṇini's rules do not necessarily apply to his own technical language.

6. The verbal base *kṛ-* is mentioned as *kṛÑ* in the present rule (compare *ḌUkṛÑ*, *Dhātup.* 8.10). According to P. 1.3.72 a verb marked with *Ñ* takes *ātm.* endings when the sense of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* ' the result of the action being meant to benefit the agent ' is conveyed. As stated by the *KV*, it follows that by the present rule the verb *kṛ-*, if preceded by a base in *ām*, may even take *ātm.* endings, when the question is not of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale*.

7. The word *anuprayoga* literally means ' subsequent use '. It is used three times in the A. in the sense of a verbform subsequently used. In

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

the present case, the subsequent use of *kṛ-* amounts to the use of *kṛ-* as an auxiliary verb. Compare also P. 3.1.40, *anuprayujyate.*

8. Kātyāyana has not phrased any *Vt.* on the present rule, but there is a *bhāṣya* by Patañjali. He discusses two points, the purpose of the mention of *kṛÑ-* and the character of the rule.

According to Patañjali, the mention of *kṛÑ* serves to exclude the auxiliary *as-* which is also used in the formation of the periphrastic perfect. Therefore after *as-* as an auxiliary with an *ām*-base the *parasmaipada* endings are used. The examples are *ī́hām āsa* 'he has moved', *ī́hām āsuḥ* 'they have moved' and *ī́hām āsatuḥ* 'the two of them have moved' (*Mbh.* I, p. 289, line 23). For *ī́h-* see *Dhātup.* 1.663.

Patañjali further says that *kṛÑ* may be taken as a *pratyāhāra* 'abbreviative designation'. This is what happens in the traditional interpretation of P. 3.1.40 where the mention of *kṛÑ* is supposed to include that of *as-* and *bhū-* also, under the influence of *Vt.* I on this rule. But in the present rule *kṛÑ* stands for *kṛ-* only.

The idea that *kṛÑ* can be taken as a *pratyāhāra* including *as-* and *bhū-* is postpāṇinian. Therefore, when the rule says *kṛÑ*, it means *kṛ-* and nothing more.

Then Patañajali raised the question why the *ātm.* endings are not added by P. 1.3.72 in *udumbhāṃ cakāra* 'he has filled' and *udubjāṃ cakāra* 'he has made straight' (*Mbh.* I, p. 290, line 1). The point is that, although both verbal bases (*umbhA*, *Dhātup.* 6.32 and *ubjA*, *Dhātup.* 6.20) are *udāttet* and therefore take *parasmipada* endings, still, *kṛÑ* is *Ñit.* Therefore it takes *ātm.* endings by P. 1.3 72, when the sense is that of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale.*

Patañjali's answer is that P. 1.3.63 has a double character. It is both a *niyama* 'restrictive rule' and a *vidhi* 'prescriptive rule'. P. 1.3.63 becomes a *niyama* by taking it as a restatement, namely, of *pūrvavat* in the preceding rule. That is to say, what was stated by *pūrvavat* is stated again by *āmpratyayavat.* Thereyby *āmpratyayavat* becomes redundant. But this is unthinkable. To render the word *āmpratyayavat* purposeful we will interpret it to mean *āmpratyayavad eva* '(the *ātm.* endings will be added after *kṛ-* as an auxiliary if and only if the base preceding the suffix *ām* takes *ātm.* endings' (*Mbh.* I, p. 290, line 4). This is a *niyama* 'restriction'. It follows that, since *umbh-* and *ubj-* are *parasmaipadin* bases, *kṛ-* as an auxiliary cannot take *ātm.* endings, not by any rule. In fact, it takes *parasmaipada* endings, just like the the *ām*-bases *umbh-* and *ubj-.*

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

But if P. 1.3.63 is for the sake of *niyama*, then it cannot work as a *vidhi* (*Mbh.* I, p. 290, line 4). Then how to justify forms like *ī́hāṃ cakre* ' he has moved ' and *ūhāṃ cakre* ' he has argued ' ? Both *īh-* and *ūh-* are *anudāttet.* Therefore they take the *ātm.* endings by P. 1.3.12. But for the auxiliary *kṛ-* to take *ātm.* endings in conformity we need a *vidhi*, not a *niyama*. No difficulty, Patañjali says. P. 1.3.63 is a *vidhi* also, and that can be established by continuing the word *pūrvavat* from P. 1.3.62 (*Mbh.* I, p. 290, line 5). Consequently, we will take P. 1.3.63 to mean :

a. (*niyama*) *āmpratyayavad eva kṛño 'nuprayogasya*

b. (*vidhi*) *āmpratyayavat pūrvavac ca kṛño 'nuprayogasya* ' (the *ātm.* ending are added after the auxiliary *kṛÑ* in the same manner in which (they are added after the verbal base) to which the suffix *āṃ* has been added, and (simultaneously) in the same manner in which (they are added after any) preceding (verbal base, independently of the suffix *āṃ*)'.

The difference between the two interpretations becomes clear when P. 1.3.72, *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale,* is taken into account. By the *niyama* interpretation Patañjali achieves that *kṛ-* as an auxiliary does not take *ātm.* endings even if the question is of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale*, on the condition that the base preceding *āṃ* is *parasmaipadin*. By the *vidhi-* interpretation of the rule Patañjali achieves that *kṛ-* as an auxiliary takes *ātm.* endings even if the question is not of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale*, on the condition that the base preceding *āṃ* is *ātmanepadin.*

9. The *KV* briefly repeats the two points made in Patañjali's *bhāṣya*, with a slight difference. It refers to Patañjali's twofold interpretation of the rule, as a *niyama* and as a *vidhi*, as two *yatnas* ' efforts ', that is two ways of phrasing the import of the rule. But the difference consists in this that, according to the *KV* as explained by the *Nyāsa* here, Patañjali's *vidhi* becomes the *niyama* of the *KV*, and Patañjali's *niyama* becomes the *vidhi* of the *KV*. Thus, according to the *KV*, P. 1.3.63 taken as a *niyama* is phrased as :

a. *āmpratyayavat pūrvavac ca kṛño 'nuprayogasya*, whereas the same rule taken as a *vidhi* is phrased as

b. *āmpratyayavat kṛño 'nuprayogasya.*

The result is the same as that of Patañjali's interpretation.

10. The Padamañjarī has a short and insignificant discussion on whether the *bv.* cp. *āmpratyaya* is an *atadguṇasaṃvijñāna* or a *tadguṇasaṃvijñāna bv.*

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

For the difference between the two types see *BDA*, p. 92–3. According to the *Padamañjarī*, *āmpratyaya* should be taken as an *atadguṇasaṃvijñāna bv.*

1.3.64 PROPĀBHYĀṂ YUJER AYAJÑAPĀTREṢU ' (the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* " agent ") after (the verbal base) *yuj* " to join " preceded by (the preverb) *pra* or *upa* except when the question is of vessels used in a sacrifice '

1. This is a *vidhisūtra.* See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* ' after a verbal base ' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *propābhyāṃ* (*dhātoḥ*) *yujer ayajñapātreṣu.* The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam.* By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* the previous *uddeśya kṛño ' nuprayogasya* is automatically discontinued. The previous (part-) *vidheya āmpratyavat* is discontinued on the basis of *sāmarthya*, that is, because it doesn't make sense in the present rule.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *ayajñapātreṣu* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see p. 1.3.14, sub 3.

4. *Propābhyām* and *yujeḥ* are two technical ablatives indicating a fixed sequence.

5. The form *yuji* is a quotation form of *yuj–*, by *Vt.* II on P. 3.3.108.

6. For the construction of the negation in *ayajñapātreṣu* see P. 1.3.20 sub 9.

7. Kātyāyana has not phrased any *Vt.* on the present rule, but there is a *bhāṣya* by Patañjali. He mentions a *bhāṣyavārtika* which says that, instead of *propābhyām*, the rule should read *svarādyupasṛṣṭāt* ' (after *yuj-*) which is provided with an *upasarga* " preverb " which begins with a vowel '. Thus the scope of the rule is considerably widened. Then Patañjali mentions the view of another grammarian. According to this grammarian, the word *propābhyām* should be replaced by *svarādyantopasṛṣṭāt* ' (after *yuj-*) which is provided with an *upasarga* that begins and ends with a vowel '. Thus the scope of the rule is still more widened. As noted by Kaiyaṭa here, the only preverbs excluded are *sam*, *nis* and *dus.*

The examples provided by Patañjali are *prayuṅkte* ' he uses ', *niyuṅkte* ' he enjoins ' and *viniyuṅkte* ' he assigns ' (*Mbh.* I, p. 290, line 9).

8. The example provided by the *KV* is *prayuṅkte.*

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The counterexample for the condition *ayajñapātreṣu* provided by the *KV* is *dvandvaṃ nyañci pātrāṇi prayunakti* 'he employs vessels upside down in pairs' (compare the *Bālamanoramā* on *SK*, No. 2735, p. 957).

9. The *KV* mentions the view of the other grammarian mentioned by Patañjali as a *vārttika*.

1.3.65 SAMAḤ KṢṆUVAḤ '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") after (the verbal base) *kṣṇu* "to sharpen" preceded by (the preverb) *sam*'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *samaḥ* (*dhātoḥ*) *kṣṇuvaḥ*. The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* the previous *uddeśya propābhyām*, etc. has been automatically cancelled. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

4. *Samaḥ* and *kṣṇuvaḥ* are two technical ablatives indicating a fixed sequence.

5. The verbal base *kṣṇu–* is mentioned in the *Dhātup.* 2.28 as a *parasmaipadin* base. In the form *kṣṇuvaḥ* P. 6.4.77 has been applied.

6. Kātyāyana has phrased one *vārttika* on the present rule. It says that by *saṃkṣṇu* the transitive base *saṃkṣṇu* is meant. The point is that *kṣṇu* could have been included among the verbs enumerated by P. 1.3.29 which are all of them preceded by *saṁ*. But Patañjali makes clear that P. 1.3.29 deals with intransitive verbs. Therefore, for *kṣṇu* preceded by *sam* as a transitive verb to take *ātm.* endings a separate rule is required.

7. The example provided by the *KV* is *saṁkṣṇute | samkṣṇuvāte | saṃkṣṇuvate śastram* 'he/the two of them/they sharpens/sharpen the weapon'.

1.3.66 BHUJO 'NAVANE '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") after (the verbal base) *bhuj-*, except in the sense of protecting'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ*) *bhujaḥ anavane*. The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* the previous *uddeśya* has been automatically discontinued. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, conevention 4. The previous (part-) *uddeśya samaḥ* is discontinued on the basis of *sāmarthya*, that is, because it doesn't make sense in the present rule.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *anavane* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

4. The *Dhātup.* mentions two verbal bases *bhuj-*, one belonging to the *tudādi* class (6.124) in the sense of *kauṭilya*, the other belonging to the *rudhādi* class (7.17) in the sense of *pālana* 'protecting' or *abhyavahāra* 'taking food'. The base *bhuj-* mentioned in the rule is the latter one.

5. For the construction of the negation in *anavane* see P. 1.3.20, sub 9.

6. Kātyāyana has not phrased any *vārttika* on the present rule, but there is a *bhāṣya* by Patañjali. At the beginning of his *bhāṣya* Patañjali mentions a *vārttika*-like statement. It says that, instead of *anavane*, the rule should read *anavanakauṭilayoḥ* 'except in the sense of protecting or of bending'. The examples quoted by Patañjali are *prabhujati vāsasī* 'he wrings his two pieces of clothing' and *nibhujati jānuśirasī* 'he bends his knees and his head' (*Mbh.* I, p. 290. lines 15–16).

But then Patañjali says that the statement need not be made. The *sūtra*–text is sufficiently clear to make us understand that the *rudhādi* base *bhuj–* is meant and not the *tudādi* base *bhuj-*. This is what we understand from the meaning-condition *anavane*. *Anavana* is the opposite of *avana*, and *avana* is the meaning assigned to the *rudhādi bhuj–*. Therefore only this base *bhuj–* can be meant. The meaning of the base *bhuj–* used in the examples, however is not that of *avana* and *anavana* (*Mbh.* I. P. 290, lines 16–17).

Kaiyaṭa here notes that, like connection, disconnection (*viprayoga*) also is a cause of bringing to mind a particular meaning. The example is *dhenu* which is a synonym of *dogdhrī* 'a milk–giving female'. Suppose we say *savatsā dhenur ānīyatām sakiśorā sakarabhā sabarkarā* 'let the *dhenu* be brought together with the calf, together with the colt, together with the elephant-calf (and) together with the kid'. In that case, the word *dhenu* becomes established in a particular meaning because the thing-meant is mentioned together with items which all of them mean young, suckling animals. This is a case of *saṃsarga* 'connection'. On the other hand, the same meaning *dhenu* will be understood, if we say *avatsā akiśorā akarabhā abarkarā* '(let the *dhenu* be brought) which is without a calf, without a colt, without an elephant-calf (and)

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

without a kid). This is a case of *viprayoga* 'disconnection'. *Viprayoga* implies possible connection. Therefore *avatsā* does not mean a heifer, or a cow which cannot have a calf yet, but an adult cow which can have a calf, but which has no calf. Both in the case of *saṃsarga* and of *viprayoga* the *dhenu* is brought, which proves the correct understanding. This goes to show that an item like the *rudhādi* base *bhuj-* may be correctly identified by saying *anavane*. That verbal base is to be selected which can have the meaning of *avana*. That can only be the *rudhādi* base *bhuj-*.

The terms *saṃsarga* and *viprayoga* have been mentioned in Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya*, *kāṇḍa* II, stanza 315, in an enumeration of ways to identify a particular meaning. Compare also *vākyapadīya of Śrī Bhartṛhari*, edited by K. V. Abhyankar and V. P. Limaye. *University of Poona Sanskrit and Prakrit Series*, Vol. II. Poona, 1965, Appendix III, p. 329, lines 18-22.

7. The examples provided by the *KV* for the *rudhādi bhuj-* are *bhuṅkte* 'he eats' and *bhuñjate* 'they eat'.

The counterexample for the meaning-condition *anavane* provided by the *KV* is *bhunakty enam agnir āhitaḥ* 'the fire to which fuel has been added protects him'.

The counterexample for the *rudhādi* base *bhuj-* provided by the *KV* is *vibhujati pāṇim* 'he bends his hand'.

1.3.67 ṆER AṆAU YAT KARMA ṆAU CET SA KARTĀNADHYĀNE '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" immediately after a verbal base) ending in (the suffix) *Ṇi*, if (what is) the direct object, given (a verbal base) not ending in *Ṇi*, (functions as) the agent, given (the same verbal base) ending in *Ṇi*, except in the sense of remembering longingly'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *ṇer (dhātoḥ) aṇau yat karma ṇau cet sa kartā anadhyāne*. The *vidheya* is (*kartari ātmanepadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya* the previous *uddeśya*, *bhujaḥ anavane*, is automatically discontinued. See Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *anadhyāne* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

4. The suffix *Ṇi*(*C*) meant here is the one prescribed by P. 3.1.26. It has been prescribed in the sense of *hetumat* ' (an action, *karman*) possessing a cause ', that is, a caused action. Thus a causative verbal base is formed.

For the interpretation of the form *aṇi* see P. 1.3.88, sub 4. The locatives *aṇau* and *ṇau* are taken as locatives absolute.

5. For the meaning condition *anadhyāne* compare P. 1.9.46.

6. The *ṇer aṇau* rule opens a small section dealing with *ātm.* endings to be added after causative bases. The section ends with P. 1.3.71.

7. For a good understanding of the present rule it may be pointed out that

a. P. 1.3 67 is an exception to P. 1.3.78 which prescribes the *parasmaipada* endings as the general rule;

b. As stated by the *KV*, we can have the *ātm.* endings for causative bases by P. 1.3.74 in the sense of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphalam* ' the result of the action being intended for the agent '. An example is *kaṭam kārayate* ' he causes (someone) to make a mat for himself '. The *KV* therefore infers that the present rule is meant to have the *ātm.* endings for causative verbs even when the sense of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphalam* is lacking. That is to say, according to the *KV*, the present rule is an exception to P. 1.3.74.

c. The present rule, according to which the *karman* appears as the agent, has been associated in Sanskrit grammatical tradition with another Pāṇini-rule, P. 3.1.87. According to this latter rule also, an item which normally figures as a *karman* appears as the agent. The result is a passive-like construction which is called *karma-kartṛ*. But whereas P. 3.1.87 deals with non-causatives, P. 1.3.67 deals with causative formations. There are other differences also.

d. The *ātm.* endings prescribed by P. 1.3.67 and required by P. 3.1.87 are in both cases connected with a reflexive sense.

e. P. 1.3.67 deals with active causative usages which, from the transformational point of view, can be called reflexive only in an unusual sense.

8. Kātyāyana has phrased nine *Vts* on the present rule. *Vt.* I says that the same *karman* ' direct object ' which is the *karman* of the non-causative verb is also understood to be the *karman* of the causative verb. In fact, this is what turns the causative into a reflexive causative. *Vt.* II states an undesired consequence : otherwise, that is, if that same *karman* is not understood in connection with the causative verb, the *ātm.* endings would become applicable

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

everywhere. Patañjali provides the example *ārohanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ. Ārohayamāṇo hastī sthalam ārohayati* 'the elephant keepers mount the elephant. While allowing itself to be mounted the elephant causes the men (not to mount itself but) to mount the seat' (*Mbh.* I, p. 291, lines 2–3). This is the counterexample quoted by the *KV* for the words *yat...sa* in the rule. Nāgeśa on *Bh.* No. 2 on the present rule explains that by *sthalam* the wooden seat on the back of an elephant is meant. This meaning for *sthalam* is only attested here. Kātyāyana's point in the *Vts* I and II is that, if no explicit provision is made in P. 1.3.67 to ensure that the *karman* of the non-causative returns as the *karman* of the causative verb, the *ātm.* endings might be added after causative bases by P. 1.3.67, when a reflexive sense is lacking.

Patañjali rejects both *Vts.* He thinks that we can have the same result by *yogavibhāga* 'splitting up of the rule'. He proposes (*Mbh.* I, p. 291, lines 5–7) to split up P. 1.3.67 into three part-statements. The first statement (a) says *ṇeḥ* 'after (a verbal base) ending in (the causative suffix) *Ṇi* (the *ātm.* endings are added)'. The second statement (b) says *aṇau yat karma ṇau cet* 'if (what is) the *karman*, given (a verbsl base) not ending in *Ṇi* (is also the *karman*) given (the same verbal base) ending in *Ṇi*'. The third statement (c) says *sa kartā* '(if that *karman* becomes) the agent (given the verbal base ending in *Ṇi*)'. The condition *anadhyāne* being self-evident is omitted. Thus, whereas (a) is a general prescription of *ātm.* endings after a base ending in *Ṇi*, (b) and (c) lay down conditions: the *karman* of the non-causative base must also be a *karman* of the causative base, and the *karman* of the non-causative base must become the agent of the causative base.

Kaiyaṭa, on *Bh.* No. 2 on the present rule, defends the two *Vts.* He clearly understands *Vt.* I to mean that the causative verb should not have any other object than the *karman* of the non-causative verb. Compare also Kaiyaṭa on *Bh.* No. 17 on the present rule, in connection with the example *smarayaty enam vanagulmaḥ svayam eva.* He says that, if P. 1.3.67 is taken as one sentence (and not as three part-statements as proposed by Patañjali), we cannot exclude the possibility of the *ātm* ending added, when the *karman* of the causative verb is different from that of the non-causative verb, like in Patañjali's *sthalam*-example. That is why the *Vts* are required.

Vts III–VII deal with the question why P. 1.3.67 is required at all. What exactly is the example for this rule to become purposeful? *Vt.* III is an *iticet-vārttika.* It contains an objection and a refutation. The objection says that P. 1.3.67 is redundant. The reason is that we can manage by P. 3.1.87. This is the rule for the non-causative *karmakartṛ*-construction which also

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

requires the *ātm.* endings (by P. 1.3.13). The refutation says that, in that case, we will say that, still, P. 1.3.67 has a purpose, namely, to prevent the addition of the *vikaraṇas yaK* and *CiṆ*. Reference is to P. 3.1.67 and P. 3.1.66. But this refutation is itself refuted by *Vt.* IV. The reason is that we already have a *Vt.* (*Vt.* I on P. 3.1.89) which prohibits the addition of *yaK* and *CiṆ* in the case of bases ending in *Ṇi*.

Patañjali says that we have to accept this prohibition anyway (*Mbh.* I. p. 291, line 18), and then introduces *Vt.* V. This *Vt.* states the reason why we have to accept the prohibition referred to. The reason is that otherwise, if *Vt.* I on P. 3.1.89 is rejected, we have to phrase a prohibition for cases other than the ones covered by the restriction stated in P. 1.3.67, namely, that the *karman* of the non-causative base must become the agent of the causative verb. Which other cases ? Patañjali provides the example *gaṇayati gaṇaṃ gopālakaḥ* 'the cowherd counts the herd', and *gaṇayati gaṇaḥ svayam eva* 'the herd counts of its own' (*Mbh.* I, p. 291, line 21). This is the counterexample quoted by the *KV* for the word *aṇau* in P. 1.3.67. The point is that the verbal base *gaṇay-* has not been formed with the causative suffix *Ṇi* but by the suffix *Ṇi* prescribed by P. 3.1.25. *Vt.* VI says that, moreover, in addition to a prohibition of the *vikaraṇas yaK* and *CiṆ*, we would have to phrase a prohibition of *ātm.* endings for these cases. Patañjali provides the example *gaṇayatī gaṇaḥ svayam eva* 'the herd counts of its own' (*Mbh.* I, p. 291, line 23). *Vt.* VII attempts to refute *Vt.* VI by saying that P. 1.3.67 itself serves to prohibit the *ātm.* endings in the cases referred to. The ides is that the present rule deals with verbal bases showing a stage in which they do not end in *Ṇi*, and a stage in which they do end in *Ṇi*. Thereby class X verbal bases like *gaṇay-* are excluded. But in his *bhāṣya* on *Vt.* VII Patañjali rejects this *Vt.* P. 1.3.67 does not just deal with verbs showing a non-*ṇi* stage and a *ṇi*-stage, but with verbs whose *karman* of the non-*ṇi* stage becomes the agent of the *ṇi*-stage. Then what about bases which have neither a *karman* nor an agent before *Ṇi* is added like *gaṇay-* ? The point is that class X verbal bases are never without *Ṇi*.

Then what could be the purpose of P. 1.3.67 ? In *Bh.* No. 17 on the present rule Patañjali tries to find such a purpose in the condition *anadhyāne* 'except in the sense of remembering longingly'. The proposal is slightly funny, because why should the whole of P. 1.3.67 be stated just for the purpose of one exception ? But, as stated by Kaiyaṭa on *Bh.* No. 17, an exception cannot be stated without its domain being stated. Patañjali provides the example *smarati vanagulmasya kokilaḥ* 'the cuckoo longingly remembers the forest thicket', and *smārayaty enaṃ vanagulmaḥ svayam eva* 'the

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

forest thicket of its own causes it (the cuckoo) to remember' (*Mbh.* I, p. 292, line 3). This is the counter-example quoted by the *KV* for the meaning-condition *anādhyāne*. Now the reasoning goes as follows. In the case of a *karmakartṛ* – construction an *ātm.* ending be added by P. 3.1.87. But this rule deals with *karmasthabhāvaka* and *karmasthakriyaka* verbs only. *Smṛ-*, however, is a *kartṛsthabhāvaka* verb. Therefore, if an *ātm.* is added at all, it would have to be by P. 1.3.67. But this rule contains the condition that the causative verb must have no other *karman* than that of the non-causative verb. In *smarayaty enaṃ vanagulmaḥ svayam eva* we find another object, different from the object of the non-causative verb, namely, *enam*. Therefore, since on the basis of the condition P. 1.3.67 cannot become applicable in the example, it cannot be the purpose of the word *anādhyāne* to prohibit the application of this rule to the example stated. That purpose has already been served.

Then what ? Patañjali's reasoning is that since the word *anādhyāne* appears to be redundant, it is meant to give us a clue. As stated by Patañjali, the clue consists in this that the *ātm.* endings may be added to verbs of the same kind (*Mbh.* I, p. 292, line 6). That is to say, they may be added to verbs which convey a sense of longing, which are *kartṛsthakriyaka* and which have an object of their own, on the condition that the *karman* of the verb in its non-*ṇi* stage appears as the agent of the same verb ending in *Ṇi*. Then Patañjali provides what is the genuine example for P. 1.3.67, namely, *paśyantī bhṛtyā rājānam* 'the servants see the king (with longing)', and *darśayate bhṛtyai rājā* 'the king causes his servants to see himself (with longing)' (*Mbh.* I, p. 292, line 7). Compare *KARA*; Note (184).

Vt. VIII states a prohibition of the *ātm.* endings when the word *ātman* functions as the direct object of the causative verb. Patañjali provides the example *hanty ātmānam* 'he kills himself' and *ghātayaty ātmā* 'he himself causes (himself) to kill (himself)'. *Vt.* IX rejects *Vt.* VIII. The idea is that in *ghātayaty ātmā* P. 1.3.67 does not apply, because the object of the non-causative verb does not become the agent of the causative verb. In fact, these are two different *ātmans*. Patañjali explains that one is the *antarātman*, the inner self, and that the other is the *śarīrātman* 'the bodily self'. The difference according to Patañjali, consists in this that the *antarātman* performs the action by which the bodily *ātman* experiences comfort or pain (*Mbh.* I, p. 292, lines 14–16). Kaiyaṭa, in his comment here, draws attention to the difference in views between *Sāṃkhya* and the Naiyāyikas. According to *Sāṃkhya*, the *antarātman* is a separate organ, whereas according to the Naiyāyikas the *antarātman* is just another name for the *puruṣa*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

9. The *KV* provides three pairs of examples. Each pair contains a simple verbal base to which the causative suffix *Ṇi* has not been added, and the same verbal base to which *Ṇi* has been added to form a causative verbal base. The examples are as follows :

(1.1) *ārohanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ* ' the elephant keepers mount the elephant '

(1.2) *ārohayate hastī svayam eva* ' the elephant of its own causes to mount itself '

(2.1) *upasiñcanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ* ' the elephant keepers sprinkle the elephant '

(2.2) *upasecayate hastī svayam eva* ' the elephant of its own causes to sprinkle itself '

(3.1) *paśyanti bhṛtyā rājānam* ' the servants see the king '

(3.2) *darśayate rājā svayam eva* ' the king of his own causes to see himself '.

The first part-example *ārohanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ* and the complete third example are mentioned by Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 291, line 4; p. 292, line 7). An example similar to the *KV*–sentence (2) is discussed by P. Kiparski and J. F. Staal, " Syntactic and Semantic Relations in Pāṇini " Foundations of Language, Dordrecht : D. Reidel Publishing Company, Vol. 5, (1969), p. 100–102 (*kareṇur ārohayate niṣādinam*, wrongly translated as ' the elephant allows itself to be mounted by the elephant–driver '; the quote is taken from the *Śiśupālavadha* 12.5. The third example is discussed in *KARA*, Notes (182) – (184). The first and the third examples are discussed by S. D. Joshi, " The Reflexive Constructions in Pāṇini ", *CASS Studies*, Number 6, University of Poona 1981, p. 205–208. The example *ārohayate hastī svayam eva* is also discussed by P. Filliozat, "The Pāṇinian Conception of *Karmakartṛ*" *Proceedings of the International Seminar on Studies in the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, edited by S. D. Joshi and S. D. Laddu, University of Poona, Pune 1983, P. 13–14. The same example and the third example of the *KV* are discussed by Mallinātha on *Kirātārjunīya* 1.10. See Roodbergen 1984, p. 27–29.

Given the two sentences of each example, the idea lies near to derive the second sentence from the first by changing the structure of the first sentence. This amounts to a transformational approach. We will see that such an approach is known in the history of Skt. linguistics. In fact, it goes back to Bhartṛhari. But in Pāṇini's derivational procedure sentences, or rather

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

their structures are never derived from other sentence-structures. That is to say, each sentence is to be derived as a single sentence depending on the syntactic properties of the items involved. One of these properties of one particular item involved in the construction according to P. 1.3.67 is that it must function as the *karman* in the non-causative stage of the verb with which it is to be connected as the agent in its causative stage. Another syntactic property is that the *karman* of the non-causative stage must also be the *karman* of the causative stage. This to ensure what we call the reflexive sense. This should, of course, not be taken to mean that a transformational approach is out of the question in respect of Skt sentences. It is merely un-Pāṇinian, but, as stated, Bhartṛhari has already made use of it. It is this approach which will be adopted again in connection with the *KV*-examples. Thus an effort will be made to derive the second sentences from the first ones in a step-by-step procedure. Each step represents the application of one grammatical operation. The result is that between the first and second sentences of the *KV* a number of intermediate stages will be inserted. It is hoped that this insertion will clarify features of the causative and reflexive structure of Skt sentences. It is also hoped that some insight may be gained in the use of ergative constructions in Skt. Accordingly, we start from what may be considered a simple, non-causative, non-reflexive matrix sentence. We will arrive, hopefully, at the equivalent of the second sentences of the *KV*, both in English and in Sanskrit.

At this point it may be useful to mention a few elementary matters regarding causatives and reflexives. In Sansktit and English a causative phrase structure requires two agents, one who causes and one who does. We will designate them as the causing agent and the caused agent. Other designations are prompting agent and prompted agent. The Skt terms are *prayojakakartṛ* and *prayojyakartṛ*. A reflexive phrase structure requires one and the same individual to be involved in the action twice, as the agent and as the direct object: *John shaves John*. In such a case a reflexive pronoun is used in English: *John shaves himself*. The same goes for Sanskrit.

Let us take a simple, general example, first in English, then in Skt. We start from

(1) John cooks the rice

Causativization as the first step gives us

(2) Peter causes John to cook the rice

Reflexivization as the second step gives us

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

(3) John causes John to cook the rice

Replacement of one word *John* by the reflexive pronoun as the third step gives us

(4) John causes himself to cook the rice

Or, in Sanskrit

(1) *devadatta odanaṃ pacati*

(2) *yajñadatta odanaṃ pācayati devadattena*

(3) *devadatta odanaṃ pācayati devadattena*

(4) *devadatta odanaṃ pācayaty ātmanā*

Instead of the *parasmaipada* ending in *pācayati* the *ātm.* ending may also be used, by P. 1.3.74, assuming that the result of the action is meant to benefit the agent, as seems probable in the circumstances given. We note the reflexive pronoun takes the instr. ending. We also note that the resulting stage (4) is rather different form the sentences (1.2), (2.2) and (3.2) of the *KV.*

Back to the examples of the *KV.* First in English. We start from

(1.1) the elephant keepers mount the elephant. Causativization gives us

(1.2) X causes the elephant keepers to mount the elephant

Next comes reflexivization. But here we see a difference with the example of John cooking the rice. Whereas in this example the word representing the causing agent is replaced by the word representing the original agent, in the *KV* examples it is the word representing the original object which replaces the word representing the causing agent. Or, in other words, *x* is not replaced by the word *elephant keepers* but by the word *elephant.* The result is obviously a reflexive phrase. But it is important here to remember that the reflexivization does not concern the original agent. It concerns the original object. The result is

(1.3) the elephant causes the elephant keepers ot mount the elephant

Replacement by the reflexive pronoun gives us

(1.4) the elephant causes the elephant keepers to mount itself

Then in Sanskrit

(1.1) *ārohanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ*

(1.2) *devadatto hastinaṃ ārohayati hastipakān*

(1.3) *hastī hastinam ārohayati hastipakān*

(1.4) *hasty ātmānam ārohayate*

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

In stage (1.2) the acc. *hastipakān* is used by P. 1.4.52, because *āruh-* is a *gatyartha* verb. In stage (1.4) the reflexive pronoun takes the acc. ending. The object *hastipakān* is necessarily dropped by *Vt.* I on P. 1.3.67, and the *ātm.* ending is added by P. 1.3.67 itself. The outcome is a phrase rather similar to sentence (1.2) of the *KV.*

To repeat this process for the English equivalents of the other two examples would be tedious. But it has to be repeated for the Skt sentences, because what matters here is the final stage reached. That is the stage essential for comparison with the *KV*-sentences (2.2) and (3.2). Therefore what follows is the step-by-step derivation of the second and third examples in Skt, in full :

(2.1) *upasiñcanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ*

(2.2) *devadatto hastinam vpasecayati hastipakaiḥ*

(2.3) *hastī hastinam upasecayati hastipakaiḥ*

(2.4) *hasty ātmānam upasecayate*

and

(3.1) *paśyanti bhṛtyā rājānam*

(3.2) *devadatto rājānaṃ darśayati bhṛtyaiḥ/bhṛtyān*

(3.3) *rājā rājānaṃ darśayati bhṛtyaiḥ/bhṛtyān*

(3.4) *rājātmānaṃ darṣayate*

In stage (3.2) the alternative form *bhṛtyān* is allowed by *Vt.* I on P. 1.4.53.

In these two examples also it is obvious that the stages (2.4) and (3.4) are rather similar to the sentences (2.2) and (3.2) of the *KV.* But there are some differences too. In the *KV* sentences the reflexive pronoun is not used. Secondly, the words *svayam eva* have been added. Therefore, to reach complete similarity between the derived sentences (1,4), (2.4), (3.4) and the *KV* sentences (1.2), (2.2) and (3.2) what we need is one deletion rule and one addition rule. For the deletion rule we can refer to Kātyāyana, *Vt.* VIII on P. 1.3.67. Here he forbids the use of the word *ātmānam* as the direct object of a causative verb. For the addition rule there is no explicit Skt grammatical rule. The addition is a matter of *vivakṣā*, the speaker's freedom to express as he likes. The words *svayam eva* serve to exclude any agent other than the one mentioned, and they serve to highlight the peculiar, fully idiomatic meaning of the Sanskrit phrase, namely, the extreme ease with which the action is performed. That gives us, in all, four intermediate stages.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

One conclusion to be drawn from all this is that the sentences (1.2), (2.2) and (3.2) of the *KV* can be shown to be the outcome of a regular transformational process which includes causativization and reflexivization in the sense defined.

10. Can any other conclusions be drawn, for instance, with regard to the character of *karmakartṛ* constructions? Before answering this question it is necessary to investigate more closely the connection between P. 1.3.67 and P. 3.1.87.

Let us bring the two rules more sharply into focus by contrasting them:

a. P. 1.3.67 directly prescribes the *ātm.* endings. P. 3.1.87 indirectly requires them.

b. The ātm. endings prescribed by P. 1.3.67 do not convey the sense of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphalam* (P. 1.3.72). P. 3.1.87 does not imply such a restriction.

c. P. 1.3.67 prescribes the addition of the causative suffix *ṆI*, followed by an *ātm.* ending. P. 3.1.87 requires the addition of the *vikaraṇa yaK* after which an *ātm.* ending is added.

d. Since *yaK* is the suffix used for the formation of passive verb forms, it follows that the forms derived by P. 3.1.87 look like passives. In fact, they combine passive verb morphology with a non-passive, reflexive meaning.

e. By P. 1.3.67 the non-causative *karman* appears as the causative agent. By P. 3.1.87 the non-causative agent is treated like a *karman*. That is to say, rules applicable to a *karman* 'direct object' become applicable to the word functioning as the *karman*. But in putting the matter like this the common feature of both rules may be lost from sight.

An example for P. 3.1.87 is *devadatta odanaṃ pacati* 'Devadatta cooks the porridge' and *odanaḥ pacyate svayam eva* 'the porridge cooks of its own'. Normally, as exemplified by the first sentence, the porridge functions as the direct object of cooking. But in the second sentence it figures as the agent. This agent-word is then treated like a *karman* for grammatical, word-form purposes. That is what the name *karmakartṛ* says. We conclude that the common feature of the construtions intended by P. 1.3.67 and P. 3.1.87 consists in this that a *karman* becomes agent. A counterexample for P. 3.1.87 is *devadattaḥ sthālyām pacati* 'Devadatta cooks in a pot' and *sthālī pacati* 'the pot cooks nicely'. The point is that a pot does not normally function as the *karman* of the cooking action. Therefore here P. 3.1.87 cannot apply.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

f. The usages derived by P. 1.3.67 and P. 3.1.87 convey an idiomatic meaning. This meaning is that the action signified by the respective verb forms, a causative and a non-causative, is performed with extreme ease: the elephant allows to mount itself easily, because it is well-trained, the king allows *darshana* of his person, because he is a gracious king, the porridge cooks of its own, because it is so easy.

Keeping these points in mind it is easy to see what happens. In these cases what happens is that a normally transitive verb is used intransitively without mention of the original agent. One might say that the action of this agent has been transferred to the original *karman*. Or, to put it in short formula, the transitive *karman* appears as the intransitive agent. In the case of P. 1.3.67, which deals with causatives, this requires *ātmanepada* verb morphology. In the case of P. 3.1.87, which deals with non-causatives, this requires passive verb morphology.

Verbs which are usually transitive but which can be used intransitively without mention of the original agent are called ergatives. Some English examples are *John opens the door* and *the door opens*, *John rang the bell* and *the bell rang*. In some cases the intransitive use requires an adverb, as in *John handles the car* and *the car handles well*. The Skt examples are all of this latter type in English. The conclusion is that the constructions prescribed by P. 1.3.67 and P. 3.1.87 are ergative verb uses in Sanskrit.

11. Early Skt tradition-for all we know, from Kātyāyana onwards-has tried to delimit the domains of P. 1.3.67 and P. 3.1.87 in a different way. Use is made of a semantic criterion which relates to different types of *karman*. As stated by Bhartṛhari, *VP*. 3.7.47, 50-51, a distinction can be made between a *nirvartyakarman*, a *vikāryakarman* and *prāpyakarman*. Examples are respectively *kaṭaṃ karoti* 'he makes a mat', *taṇḍulān pacati* 'he cooks the rice-grains' and *ādityaṃ paśyati* 'he sees the sun'. Here we find succesively an item which is produced, an item which is subjected to change-the rice grains are softened-and an item which is simply reached. In the last case, any effect of the action on the object-item is not understood. See *KARA*, p. 163-4.

Accordingly, a distinction is introduced between verb meanings. Some verbs denote an activity (*vyāpāra*) which has as its effect (*phala*) either the production of, or a change in the object-item. Such verbs are called *karmasthakriyā* (*Vt.* VIII on P. 3.1.87) or *karmasthakriyaka* 'denoting a karman-located action'. That is to say, the effect of the action, the *phala*

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

of the action is noticeable in the object-item. Other verbs do not denote such an activity. No effect is visible in the object-item. Whatever effect is there remains mainly restricted to the agent. Such verbs could be generally called *kartṛsthakriyaka* 'denoting a *kartṛ*-located action'. But here a distinction is made between verbs denoting physical movement and verbs not denoting such movement. Verbs of physical movement are called *kartṛsthakriyaka* proper, whereas the other verbs are called *kartṛsthabhāvaka* 'denoting a *kartṛ*-located state/condition'. Compare *VP.* 3.7.66 ab, *viśeṣadarśánam yatra kriyā tatra vyavasthitā* '(according to some) action is located where a difference is seen (whether in the agent or in the *karman*)'. Returning to the examples for the three types of *karman* quoted above, we may say that *kṛ-* in *kaṭaṃ karoti* is *karmasthakriyaka*, that *pac-* in *taṇḍulān pacati* is also *karmasthakriyaka* (it is called *karmasthabhāvaka* too); and that *dṛś-* in *ādityaṃ paśyati* is *kartṛsthabhāvaka*. A verse quoted in the *KV* on P. 3.1.87 sums up the various possibilities as follows:

karmasthaḥ pacer bhāvaḥ karmasthā ca bhideḥ kriyā|māsāsibhāvaḥ kartṛsthaḥ kartṛsthā ca gameḥ kriyā|| 'pac- is *karmasthabhāva* (*ka*), *bhid-* 'to break' is *karmasthakriya*(*ka*), *ās-* in *māsam āste* "he stays for a month" is *kartṛsthabhāva*(*ka*), and *gam-* "to go" is *kartṛsthakriya*(*ka*)'.

As regards the separate domains of P. 1.3.67 and P. 3.1.87, the accepted view is that the first rule is restricted to *kartṛsthabhāvaka* and *kartṛsthakriyaka* verbal bases. See *SK*, No. 2738 on P. 1.3.87. On the other hand, P. 3.1.87 is considered to deal with *karmasthabhāvaka* and *karmasthakriyaka* verbal bases. See *SK*. No. 2766 on P. 3.1.87. Thus, whareas by 3.1.87 we can have the usage *pacyata odanaḥ svayam eva* 'the porridge cooks of its own', because *pac-* is a *karmasthabhāvaka* verb, we cannot have the usage *pācayata odanaḥ svayam eva* 'the rice causes to cook itself of its own' by P. 1.3.67, for the very same reason. When argued in this way, the difference in construction intended by P. 1.3.67 and P. 3.1.87 goes back to a difference in verb meanings based on different types of *karman*.

The verbal bases mentioned in *KV* sentences are *ruh-* 'to mount', *sic-* 'to sprinkle' and *dṛś-* 'to see'. *Ruh-* in its usual meaning of 'to mount' and *sic-* are *kartṛsthakriyaka* bases, whereas *dṛś-* is a *kartṛsthabhāvaka* verb. Therefore the examples provided by the *KV* come all of them within the domain of P. 1.3.67. One corolary of this is that the sentence *āruhyate hastī svayam eva* in the sense of 'the elephant mounts of its own' a *karmakartṛ* construction by P. 3.1.87-cannot be correct, unless the meaning of *ruh-* is

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

changed. This point will play an important role in the discussion to come. The example *āruhyate*, etc. is mentioned by Kaiyaṭa on *Bh.* No. 19 on P. 1.3.67. It is ascribed by Nāgeśa to the authors of the *Bhāgavṛtti*. To Kaiyaṭa's opinion, the example is incorrect.

12. The example *ārohanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ* 'the elephant keepers mount the elephant' and *ārohayate hastī* 'the elephant (of its own) causes to mount itself' has been discussed by Bhartṛhari in the *sādhana*-section of the *VP*. By *sādhana* Bhartṛhari understands the power or capacity individuals have to participate in an action, help to bring about that action. To Bhartṛhari every individual is nothing but an aggregate of such inherent capacities (*VP.* 3.7.2). This assumption is meant to explain the great variety of ways in which individuals can be presented by language. In different situations speakers may want to highlight different capacities. As far as presentation by means of words is concerned, the speaker has unlimited freedom, or so it seems. It all depends on his *vivakṣā* 'desire to express (something)'. That gives us *sthālyāṃ pacatī* 'he cooks in a pot', *sthālyā pacati* 'he cooks with a pot', or *sthālī pacati* 'the pot does the cooking'. It also gives us expressions in which what should be a *karman* by all reckoning is presented as the agent, *karmakartṛ*- constructions which form the domain of both P. 1.3.67 and P. 3.1.87. To have such a construction, such an expression, two conditions on the part of the speaker must be met :

a. he should not want to express the activity of what is normally the agent,

b. he should want to present what is normally the object of the verb used as an independent agent with regard to the action (*Vt. V* on P. 3.1.87).

The *VP*- passages relevant to the elephant example are two, *VP.* 3.7.56 and *VP.* 3.7.59-60. They are indispensable for understanding the discussion by the later commentators. They read as follows :

56. *nivṛttapreṣaṇaṃ karma svakriyāvayave sthitam| nivartamāne karmatve sve kartṛtve 'vatiṣṭhate||* 'a *karman* "direct object" from which instigation by an agent has been removed remains (active) in its own part (=contribution) to the (main) action. When it has ceased to be a *karman*, it exercises its own function of agent.'

The expression *nivṛttapreṣaṇaṃ karma* re-occurs in *VP.* 3.7.63 a, whereas *nivṛttapreṣaṇa* is used as a qualifier of *dhātu* 'verbal base' in *VP.*

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

3.7.60 c. Helārāja (on *VP.* 3.7.56, Text Subramania Iyer, p. 273, lines 7–10) clearly takes *karman* in the sense of *karmakāraka*, not in that of *kriyā* 'action'. The example quoted by Helārāja here (Text, p. 273, line 2) is *pacyate odanaḥ svayam eva* 'the porridge cooks of its own'. This is the *karmakartṛ* construction prescribed by P. 3.1.87. For the part-contribution of the *karman* and its independence as regards this contribution see *KARA*, Note (21).

59. *nyagbhāvanānyagbhavanaṃ ruhau śuddhe pratīyate| nyagbhāvanānyagbhavanaṃ ṇyante 'pi pratipadyate ||*

60. *avasthāṃ pañcamīm āhur ṇyaante tam karmakartari| nivṛttapreṣaṇād dhātoḥ prākṛte 'rthe ṇij ucyate||* 'given the primitive base *ruh-* (without *ṆiC*), (the action) *nyagbhāvanā* " causing to bend down " and *nyagbhavanam* " bending down " is understood. *Nyagbhāvanā* and *nyagbhavanaṃ* are known, also when the question is of (*ruh-*) ending in (the causative suffix) *Ṇi*. When (*ruh-*) ends in *Ṇi* (and) when the agent (is treated as) the *karman*, that they call the fifth stage. After the verbal base from which an agent's instigation has been removed (the suffix) *ṆiC* is stated in the original sense (of the verbal base, namely, *nyagbhavanam* " bending down "). '

To talk of *nyagbhāvanā* and *nyagbhavanam* as " meanings " of the verb *ruh-* is rather confusing. What is analysed here is not the meaning of the verb *ruh-*, but the action denoted by *ruh-*. *Nyagbhāvanā* and *nyagbhavanam* are actions associated with *ruh-*, when the question is of mounting an elephant (or a camel, for that matter), not when the question is of mounting a tree or a mountain. *Nyagbhāvanā* is a means to an end. The elephant keepers cause the elephant to lower itself in order to mount it. As a result, the elephant lowers itself, *nyagbhavanam*. Strictly speaking, if *nyagbhāvanā* and *nyagbhavanam* were meanings of *ruh-*, then, since the effect of the action is seen in the elephant, the verb *ruh-* would be a *karmasthakriyaka* verb. Consequently, *ārohayate hastī svayam eva* could not be an example for P. 1.3.67. The correct example in that case should he *āruhyate hastī svayam eva*, by P. 3.1.87.

As a matter of fact, Helārāja, in his commentary on *VP.* 3.7.59–60, observes that the two example sentences here are *āruhyate hastī svayam eva* 'the elephant of its own mounts easily' and *ārohayanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ* 'the elephant keepers cause to mount the elephant'.

According to Bhartṛhari's scheme, we distinguish five stages, two for *ruh-* pure and simple, two for *ruh-* followed by *ṆiC*, and a separate *karmakartṛ* construction, as follows :

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

A. Without *ṆiC.*

1. *ārohanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ* 'the elephant keepers mount the elephant'. Helārāja, Text, P. 276, lines 11–12, explains the meaning as *nyagbhavantaṃ nyagbhāvayanti* 'they cause the one which bends down to bend down'. Thus the elephant keepers function as the *prayojakakartṛ* whose activity is *nyagbhāvanā*, whereas the elephant functions as the *prayojyakartṛ* whose activity is *nyagbhvanam.*

2. *āruhyate hastī svayam eva* 'the elephant of its own mounts easily'. That is to say, *nyagbhavati* 'it bends down'. See Helārāja, Text 1963, p. 276, line 24 – p. 277, line 1. For *ṇic* (p. 276, line 25) read *ṇic.*

B. With *ṆiC*

1. *ārohayanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ* 'the elephant keepers cause to mount the elephant'. See Helārāja, Text 1963, p. 276, line 24, and p. 277, lines 1–2. It amounts to meaning *nyagbhāvayanti*, like A. 1.

2. *ārohayati hastī hastipakān* 'the elephant causes the elephant keepers to mount'. That is to say, the elephant being well-trained invites the elephant keepers to mount, as it were. This amounts to *nyagbhavnam* on the part of the elephant, like A. 2.

C. *Karmakartṛ*

ārohayate hastī svayam eva 'the elephant of its own causes to mount itself'. See Helārāja, Text 1963, p. 277, line 7. No *karman* is expressed here. Moreover, the action of the original *prayojakakartṛ*, the elephant keepers, namely, *nyagbhāvanā* 'causing to bend down' is attributed here to the elephant, the original *prayojyakartṛ* itself: the elephant causes the elephant to bend down. The present construction is obviously obtained by P. 1.3.67. Apparently, here *ruh-* is considered to be a *kartṛsthakriyaka* verb.

What about the preṣaṇa/preraṇa which has been removed? In his commentary on *VP* 3.7.56 Helārāja defines *preṣaṇa* as *dhātvarthānukūlyena ceṣṭanam* 'an effort characterized by helpfulness to put into effect the meaning denoted by a verbal base'. It is further said to be the typical activity of an agent (*kartuḥ svavyāpāraḥ*) and to be characterized by authority over other *kārakas* (*kārakāntaraviniyogalakṣaṇa*) in the sense that the agent organizes other *kārakas* and puts them to work in their different capacities.

In *pacyata odanaḥ svayam eva* what happens is that the typical activity of Devadatta in cooking the rice-porridge is attributed to the direct object with

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

a particular intention. The intention is to convey the extreme ease with which the action is performed. See Helārāja, Text 1963, p. 273, lines 10-13. By attributing Devadatta's activity to the *karman*, the porridge, Devadatta's agent-*preṣaṇa* is removed and transferred to the *karman*. Consequently, the *karman* becomes the *karmakartṛ*.

In *ārohayate hastī svayam eva*, which is a causative phrase, what happens is that the causing activity of the *prayojakakartṛ*, the elephant keepers, is attributed to the *prayojyakartṛ* the elephant, with the same intention as stated above. Thereby the elephant becomes the *prayojakakartṛ* of its own bending down activity : the elephant causes itself to bend down. By attributing the elephant keepers' causing activity (*nyagbhāvanā*) to the *karman*, the elephant, the elephant keepers' *preṣaṇa* is removed and transferred to the *karman*. Consequently, the *karman* becomes the *karmakartṛ*, only this time in a causative construction.

By the transference of the agent's activity or that of the *prayojakakartṛ* to the respective *karmans*, what is also established is a reflexive sense : the porridge cooks itself, the elephant causes itself to bend down. Presumably, this also is a feature of ergative verbs.

13. Bhaṭṭoji, *SK.* No. 2738 on P. 1.3.67, thinks that this rule contains four conditions in order to become applicable :

a. The non-causative direct object must appear as a causative direct object.

b. The action conveyed by the non-causative verb form must be the same as the action conveyed by the causative verb form.

c. The non-causative object must appear as the causative agent.

d. The sense conveyed by the verb must not be that of wistfully remembering.

Here the second condition is by no means clear from the rule itself. It is inferred from Bhartṛhari's treatment of the elephant example. It is explicitly stated by the *Nyāsa* on the *KV* on the present rule. While discussing the examples quoted by the *KV* the *Nyāsa* says that in all these examples the action in the non-causative stage must be the same as that in the causative stage. The reason given is that, although the suffix *ṆiC* is there (in B. 1 and B. 2 of Bhartṛhari's scheme), there can be no question of a different action (as compared to A. 1 and A. 2), because the relation of causing and caused agent has been abandoned.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

According to the *Padamañjarī*, it is the express purpose of the words *ṇau cet* in P. 1.3.67 to ensure that the action conveyed by the non-causative and the causative verb forms is the same. Thus what was still an inference to the *Nyāsa* is read back into the rule itself.

Here it may be observed that Pāṇini uses the term *karman* in two meanings, the technical meaning of *karmakāraka* 'the direct object *kāraka*' and the non-technical meaning of *kriyā* 'action'. For the latter meaning compare P. 1.3.14. Usually when *karman* occurs as a single word in the A. it has the technical meaning. When used in a cp. it may have the non-technical meaning depending on whether the other cp.-constituent has a non-technical meaning.

To demonstrate the four conditions Bhaṭṭoji does not take the elephant example. He chooses an example of his own. It is *paśyanti bhavaṁ bhaktāḥ* 'the devotees see Bhava' and *darśayate bhavaḥ* 'Bhava causes to see himself'.

Bhaṭṭoji's transformational sequence consists of four stages, with two intermediate steps, as follows:

A. Without *ṆiC*

(1) *pasyanti bhavaṃ bhaktāḥ* 'the devotees see Bhava'.

(2) *paśyati bhavaḥ* 'Bhava sees easily'. That is, it is easy to see Bhava.

B. With *ṆiC*

(1) *darśayanti bhavaṃ bhaktāḥ* 'the devotees cause to see Bhava'.

(2 *darśayate bhavaḥ* 'Bhava causes to see himself'. That is, he shows himself easily to his *bhaktas*.

As stated by Bhaṭṭoji, the sentences (1) and (3) and the sentences (2) and (4) convey the same meaning.

Bhaṭṭoji's scheme follows that of Bhartṛhari closely. The only difference is that, whereas Bhartṛhari's scheme has five stages, that of Bhaṭṭoji has four. From Bhartṛhari's scheme the stage B. 2 has been dropped. What remains is a sequence of four sentences, and that is the classic form of the derivational scheme.

The first intermediate step, sentence (2), is the direct counterpart of Bhartṛhari's sentence A. 2, *āruhyate hastī svayam eva*. The difference is that P. 3.1.87 cannot become applicable to *dṛś-*, because *dṛś-* is a *kartṛsthabhāvaka* verb.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Now how to argue that this sentence (2) which contains a non-causative verb form conveys the same meaning as sentence (4) which contains a causative verb form. How can *paśyati* be interpreted to mean *darśayate*? Traditionally—but where this tradition starts is not clear, maybe from later Naiyāyikas—the meaning of a transitive verb is analysed into an activity (*vyāpāra*) and a result or effect (*phala*). As explained by the *Bālamanoramā* on the *SK* here, the time-honoured example is *pac-* 'to cook'. The verbal base meaning is defined as *viklittyanukūlavyāpāra* 'an activity leading to the softening (of the rice-grains)'. Here *viklitti* 'the softening (of the rice-grains)' is the *phala*. The substratum (*āśraya*) of the activity (really a conglomerate of activities, see *Vt.* VIII on P. 1.4.23 and *VP.* 3.8.4) is the agent (*kartṛ*). The substratum of the result/effect is the the direct object (*karman*). It is further assumed that in the case of a transitive verb the word representing the *vyāpāra* and the word representing the *phala* must not be co-referential. In fact, they must refer to different items.

We notice that this *vyāpāra-phala* analysis of verb meanings introduces a causal element in each meaning which is expressed by the word *anukūla*. This causal element in the meaning-definition is not to be confused with a causative meaning conveyed by a verb.

Now suppose that the meaning of *dṛś-* is defined as *cākṣuṣajñānānukūlavyāpāra* 'an activity which leads to visual perception'. In that case, the word representing the *vyāpāra* and the word represening the *phala* would be co-referential. Seeing is not different from visual perception. The consequence is that *dṛś-* cannot be a transitive verb any more. But since it cannot be reasonably doubted that *dṛś-* normally is a transitive verb, we have to change the definition. This is done by entering the word *viṣaya* 'sense-object' into the definition. Thus we will say that *dṛś-* denotes an activity which leads to somebody or something becoming the sense-object of visual perception (*cākṣuṣajñānaviṣayāpattyanukūlavyāpāra*). Here becoming the sense-object of visual perception is the *phala*.

Back to sentence (1), *paśyanti bhavam bhaktāḥ* 'the devotees see Bhava'. According to the definition just stated, this sentence is explained to mean that the devotees turn Bhava into the sense-object of visual perception. Bhoṭṭoji's phrase is *cākṣuṣajñānaviṣayaṃ kurvanti*. If here the *preraṇāṃśa* 'activity-instigating part' expressed by *kurvanti* 'they turn into' is dropped, since this is a matter of *vivakṣā* 'the speaker's desire to express (something)' anyway, then the resulting meaning is that Bhava becomes the sense-object of

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

visual perception. Or, as Bhaṭṭoji says, *viṣayo bhavati*. Actually, this is the *phala* of the seeing activity, according to the definition stated.

Now how to express this meaning in a sentence ? As Bhaṭṭoji understands it, this is done by sentence (2), *paśyati bhavaḥ*. But this is not *paśyati bhavaḥ* in its usual meaning of 'Bhava sees'. It is *paśyati bhavaḥ* in the sense of *dṛśyate bhavaḥ*, a *karmakartṛ*-construction, if we could have that by P. 3.1.87. This, unfortunately, is not possible, because *dṛś-* is a *kartṛsthabhāvaka* verb, not a *karmasthakriyaka* one. Therefore the meaning assigned to *paśyati bhavaḥ* here has to be explained in a different way. According to the *Bālamanoramā*, recourse is had to *lakṣaṇā* 'the power of words to convey a secondary meaning'. This power comes into operation when the literal sense is blocked, and when still a connection between the literal sense and the secondary sense exists. See further Roodbergen 1984, p. 419, n. 80. By this power of *lakṣaṇā* the sentence *paśyati bhavaḥ* is taken to mean 'Bhava sees easily', a usage on a par with *sthālī pacati* 'the pot cooks nicely' and *the car handles well*, ergative verb usages. They involve a shift from the normal agent to the direct object. It is to this direct object that the normal agent's activity is attributed, and so it becomes an agent in its own right, an independent agent.

The next intermediate step is to proceed from *paśyati bhavaḥ* to *darśayanti bhavaṃ bhaktāḥ*. This is done by adding the suffix *ṆiC* in the sense of *hetumat* 'action of a causing agent'. While making this step the unusual meaning of *paśyati bhavaḥ* is left out of account. The suffix *Ṇic* is added as if *paśyati bhavaḥ* simply means 'Bhava sees'. Therefore the trick in passing from the second stage to the third stage consists in this that the sentence *paśyati bhavaḥ* is assumed to convey two different meanings at the same time.

In sentence (4), *darśayate bhavaḥ*, like in sentence (2), a *karmakartṛ* sense is conveyed. What happens here is that *prayajyakartṛ*, Bhava, asumes the function of *prayojakakartṛ* with regard to its previous *prayojakakartṛ*, the *bhaktas* : Bhava cause the *bhaktas* to see himself, that is, he causes himself to become the sense-object of visual perception by the *bhaktas*. Anyway, to Bhaṭṭoji, Bhava must be the ultimate cause of everything.

14. Then Bhaṭṭoji mentions another scheme of derivation in stages. In the *Padamañjari* (on the *KV*, ed. Shastri – Shukla, Part I, p. 466, line 24) this new scheme is referred to *aparaḥ prakāraḥ* 'another way'.

The idea goes back to Bhartṛhari again. In *VP*. 3.7.62–63 he says

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

62. *keṣāṃcid devadattāder vyāpāro yaḥ sakarmake | sa vinā devadattādeḥ kaṭādiṣu vivakṣyate ||*

63. *nivṛttapreṣaṇaṃ karma svasya kartuḥ prayojakam | preṣaṇāntarasambandhe ṇyante lenābhidhīyate||* 'according to some (grammarians), in the case of a transitive (verb), the (action-instigating) activity of Devadatta, etc. is desired to be expressed (as located) in the mat, etc. (Thereby) the *karman* " direct object " from which instigation by an agent has been removed (becomes) the *prayojaka* (*kartṛ*) of its own (earlier) agent (Devadatta, etc.) (and) it is expressed by a (substitute for) *lA*, when there is a (verbal base) ending in (the suffix) *Ṇi* which (now) becomes connected with a different action-instigating activity. '

In his commeutary here Helārāja (Text 1963, p. 278. line 15) explains *nivṛttapreṣaṇam* as *kartṛvyāpāraḥ praiṣaḥ karmaṇo 'dhyāropitaḥ* ' the *praiṣa* (i. e.,) the agent's activity of the *karman* which is imposed (on the *karman*, i. e., attributed to the *karman* '. He explains the word *preṣaṇāntara* as *prayojakavyāpārāntara* ' (an action-instigation) different from the activity of the *prayojaka* (*kartṛ*) ' which is conveyed by suffix *ṆiC* in the expression *kaṭaḥ kārayate svayam eva* ' the mat of its own causes to make itself '. This latter sentence is a (causative) *karmakartṛ*-construtiion by P. 1.3.67. But how this rule can be applied here at all is difficult to see, because *kṛ-* is a *karmasthakriyaka* verb. Therefore P. 3.1.87 applies, which gives us the (non-causative) phrase *kriyate kaṭaḥ svayam eva* ' the mat makes easily '.

Nāgeśa, in his *Laghuśabdenduśekhara*, Vol. II, Pt. 2, p. 690 line 14, mentions a different reading for *nivṛttapreṣaṇam* in *VP.* 3.7.63, namely, *svīkṛtapreṣaṇam*. This variant has not been noted by Subramania Iyer in his text edition of *kāṇḍa* III. The variant reading means ' (a *karman*) which has assumed the action-instigating activity of an agent '. Presumably, this reading is a clarification of the reading *nivṛttapreṣaṇam* known to Helārāja.

The example Bhartṛhari has in mind is obviously *devadattaḥ kaṭam karoti* ' Devadatta makes a mat ' and *kārayate kaṭaḥ svayam eva* ' the mat of its own causes to make itself '. The idea of the latter sentence, again, is that of easy making. It is not to be confused with the usage *kaṭaṃ kārayate* ' he causes (someone) to make a mat for himself ' mentioned earlier (sub 7. b). In the derivation of *kārayate kaṭaḥ svayam eva* at least four intermediate stages are required, as follows :

(1) *devadattaḥ kaṭam karoti* ' Devadatta makes a mat '

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

(2) *yajñadattaḥ kaṭaṃ kārayati devadattena* 'Yajñadatta causes Devadatta to make a mat'

(3) *kaṭaḥ kaṭaṃ kārayati devadattena* 'the mat causes Devadatta to make the mat'

(4) *kaṭa ātmānaṃ kārayati devadattena* 'the mat causes Devadatta to make itself'

(5) *kaṭa ātmānam kārayati* 'the mat causes to make itself'

(6) *kārayate kaṭaḥ svayam eva* 'the mat of its own causes to make itself'

In the Skt grammatical tradition, however, there is just one intermediate stage between (1) and (6). It may be phrased as *kaṭaḥ kārayati devadattena* 'the mat causes Devadatta to make (it)'. Thus, instead of the four derivational stages of the earlier scheme, now we have three stages. One difference is immediately clear ; the peculiar stage (2) of the earlier scheme has been dropped.

The example of the *Padamañjarī* (ed. referred to, Pt. I. p. 466, lines 24–30) is that of the elephant again. The succesive derivational stages are :

(1) *ārohanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ* 'the elephant keepers mount the elephant'. No difference with scheme I.

(2) *ārohayati hastī hastipakān* 'the elephant causes the elephant keepers to mount'. This is the causative stage in which the original object, the elephant, appears as the agent. As stated by the *Padamañjarī*, the elephant is presented as urging the elephant keepers on, in order to convey the extreme ease of the action of mounting. In this stage the suffix *ṆiC* is added to express the action-instigating activity of the elephant. In comparison with stage (1) one *preraṇa* has been added.

(3) *ārohayate hastī svayam eva* 'the elephant of its own causes to mount itself'. Here, according to the *Padamañjarī*, the speaker didn't want to express the *karman* (of the action of causing). Just like in the phrases *neha pacyate* 'cooking is not done here', or *neha bhujyate* 'eating is not done here' the *karman* is not desired to be expressed. What is intended in these phrases is the prohibition of the mere actions of cooking or eating. The finite verb ending is added in the sense of *bhāva* 'action as such'. The *Padamañjarī* adds that the intention behind the phrase *ārohayate*, etc. is that the elephant lowers itself nicely.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The *Padamañjarī* finally informs us that the second derivational scheme is known as *adhyāropitapreṣaṇapakṣa* 'alternative view in which the action-instigating activity of the agent is imposed on/ attributed to (the *karman*)'. This in distinction from the earlier scheme which is called *nivṛttapreṣaṇapakṣa* 'alternative view in which the action-instigating activity of the agent has been removed' (*KV* ed. referred to, Part I, P. 466, line 23).

More precisely, the terms *nivṛttapreṣaṇapakṣa* and *adhyāropitapreṣaṇapakṣa* refer to the distinctive stages of the two schemes. In scheme I that distinctive stage is A.2, *paśyati bhavaḥ*, in which the (original) agent's activity is removed or suppressed. In scheme II the distinctive stage can only be stage 2, *ārohayati hastī hastipakān*. Here the (original) agent's activity is superimposed on/attributed to the (original) *karman*.

Bhaṭṭoji (*SK*, No. 2738 on P. 1.3.67) briefly indicates the derivational process of scheme II for the Bhava and the elephant examples, as follows :

(1) *paśyanti* | *ārohanti*

(2) *darśayati bhavaḥ* 'Bhava causes to see' | *ārohayati hastī* 'the elephant causes to mount'

(3) *darśayate* 'causes to see himself' | *ārohayate* causes to mount itself'

Bhaṭṭoji adds that in stage (2) no *ātm.* ending is added, although the *karman* of the non-causative verb in stage (1) appears as the agent of the causative verb in stage (2). Therefore P. 1.3.67 could become applicable for adding an *ātm.* ending. But this does not happen because another condition for the application of this rule is not met, namely, that the actions conveyed by the non-causative and the causative verb forms must be the same. In scheme II, however, the actions of stage (1) and stage (2) are not the same. They are not the same because in stage (2) the meaning of *ṆiC* has been added to the simple verbal base meaning. Therefore, as compared to stage (1), the verb of stage (2) conveys an aditional *preraṇa*.

(15) Having stated the examples the *KV* proceeds to demonstrate the purpose of every word of the rule with the help of a counterexample.

The counterexample for the word *ṇeḥ* is *ārohanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ. Ārohayamāṇo hastī sādhv ārohati* 'the elephant keepers mounts the elephant, While allowing (them) to mount the elephant mounts well'. Although the word *hastin* functions as the object of the first (non-causative) sentence and as the agent of the second sentence, the finite verb *ārohati* shows a *parasmaipada*

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

ending. The point is that here a causative meaning is not expressed. Accordingly the need of a *Ṇi*-derived verbal base does not arise. In fact, what we have here is an interesting Sanskrit example of an ergative verb, as *handle* in *the car handles well*.

The counterexample for *aṇau* (compare P. 1.3.88: rendered by the *KV* as *aṇyanto yo dhātuḥ* 'a verbal base which does not end in (the suffiix) *Ṇi*') is *gaṇayati gaṇaṃ gopālakaḥ. Gaṇayati gaṇaḥ svayam eva* 'the cowherd counts the herd. The herd counts itself' (taken from Patañjali, *Mbh.* I, P. 291, line 21). Although the word *gaṇa* functions as the object of *gaṇayati* and as the agent of *gaṇayati*, and although *gaṇayati* is a *Ṇi*-derived form (by P. 3.1.25), the *parasmaipada* ending is used. The point is that *gaṇayati* is not a causative verb.

The counterexample for the word *karma* in the rule is *lunāti dātreṇa. Lāvayati dātraṃ svayam eva* 'he mows with a sickle. The sickle causes to mow by itself'. Here, although the word *dātra* functions as the agent of a causative verb, still a *parasmaipada* ending is used, because *dātra* does not function as the object of the non-causative verb, but as the *karaṇa* 'most efficient means'.

The words *ṇau cet* in the rule serve to indicate that the non-causative and causative forms must be derived from the same verbal base. The counter-example is *ārohanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ Ārohayamāṇo hastī bhītān secayati mūtreṇa* 'the elephant-keepers mount the elephant. While allowing (them) to mount the elephant wets the fearful with urine'. Here, although the word *hastin* functions as the object of a non-causative verb and as the agent of a causative verb, still the causative verb shows a *parasmaipada* ending, because the finite verb forms are derived from different verbal bases.

The words *yat* and *sa* in the rule serve to indicate that the direct object of the non-causative and the causative verbs must be the same. The counter-example is *ārohanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ. Ārohayamāṇo hastī sthalam ārohayati manuṣyān* 'the elephant keepers mount the elephant. While allowing (them) to mount the elephant causes the men to climb the seat' (taken from Patañjali *Mbh.* I, p. 291, lines 2–3). Here, although the word *hastin* functions as the object of the non-causative verb and as the agent of the causative verb, still a *parasmaipada* ending is used in *ārohayati*, because the reflexive sense is lacking in the causative. For a more detailed explanation see below, under 9.

The counterexample for the word *kartā* in the rule is *ārohanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ. Tān ārohayati mahāmātraḥ* 'the elephant-keepers mount the

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

elephant. The mahout causes them to mount'. Here, although the word *hastin* functions as the object of a non-causative verb in the first sentence, the causative form of the same verb shows a *parasmaipada* ending in the second sentence. The reason is that *hastin* does not function as the agent of the causative verb.

Finally, what is the point of the meaning-condition *anādhyāne* in the rule? The counterexample offered by the *KV* is *smarati vanagulmasya kokilaḥ* 'the cuckoo longingly remembers the forest thicket' and *smarayaty enam vanagulmaḥ svayam eva* 'the forest thicket of its own causes it (the cuckoo) to remember longingly' (taken from Patañjali, *Mbh.* I, p. 292, line 3). Here, although the word *vanagulma* functions as the object of the non-causative verb and as the agent of the causative verb, still *smarayati* shows a *parasmaipada* ending, because the question is of remembering wistfully.

1.3.68 BHĪSMYOR HETUBHAYE '(the *ātm.*-endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") after (the verbal bases) *bhī*- "to fear" and *smi*- "to feel astonishment" (ending in the causative suffix *ṆI*), to express the sense of fear/astonishment of/at the causing agent'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra.* See further P. 1.3.17, sub 3.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued form P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' (here *dhātvoḥ*, with the required *vibhaktivipariṇāma*, see Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 224) see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *ṇeḥ* 'after (a base ending in) *ṆI*' (here *ṇyoḥ*, with the required *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) is continued from P. 1.3.67.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*ṇyoḥ dhātvoḥ*) *bhīsmyoḥ hetubhaye.* The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam.* By the introduction of a new incompatible *uddeśya* the previous *uddeśya* is automatically dicontinued. See Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *hetubhaye* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

4. The two verbal bases have been stated in a form ending in the du. loc./gen. ending *-os.* But this can only be a remnant of the older use of this ending for the du. abl. See P. 1.3.10, sub 4, on P. 3.2.5. Consequently, the *vibhaktivipariṇāma* forms of *dhātoḥ* and *ṇeḥ* have been given the same ending.

5. As explained by the *KV*, the word *hetu* is used in the sense of *prayojakakartṛ* 'the causing agent'. Compare the use of *hetu* in P. 1.3.26.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

6. According to the *KV*, the meaning *bhaya* implies that of *vismaya* ' astonishment ' also.

7. The *KV* makes it clear that the *ātm.* endings are added to the two causative bases referred to even if the condition *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* (P. 1.3.72) is not met.

8. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

9. The examples provided by the *KV* are *jaṭilo bhīṣayate* ' the ascetic wearing matted hair frightens ', *muṇḍo bhīṣayate* ' the man with the shaven head frightens ' and *jaṭilo vismāpayate* ' the ascetic wearing matted hair causes astonishment '.

The counterexamples for the condition *hetubhaya* provided by the *KV* are *kuñcikayainaṃ bhāyayati* ' he scares him by means of a mask (?) ' and *rūpeṇa vismāyayati* ' he causes astonishment by means of his handsome appearance '. The point is that here the mask (?) and the handsome appearance are not the *hetu* ' causing agent ' of the fear and the astonishment, but the *karaṇa* ' means ', as stated by the *KV*.

The example *kuñcikayainaṃ bhāyayati* is borrowed from Patañjali *Mbh.* III, p. 39, line 20.

10. *Bhī-* has three different causative base forms :

a. *bhīṣay-*, condition of *hetubhaya*, augment *ṣUK* by P. 7.3.40, *ātm.* endings by P. 1.3.68.

b. *bhāpay-*, non-preferred option (*vibhāṣā*), condition of *hetubhaya*, substitution of *a* for the verbal base vowel by P. 6.1.56; augment *puK* by P. 7.3.36; *ātm.* endings by P. 1.3.68.

c. *bhāyay-*, *vṛddhi* of the verbal base vowel by P. 7.2.115; *ātm.* endings by P. 1.3.72, or *parasmaipada* endings by P. 1.3.78.

Smi- has two different causative base forms :

a. *smāpay-*, condition of *hetubhaya*, invariable substitution of *ā* for the verbal base vowel by P. 6.1.56; augment *pUK* by P. 7.3.36; *ātm.* endings by P. 1.3.68.

b. *smāyay-*, for which see under *bhī-* c.

1.3.69 GṚDHIVAÑCYOḤ PRALAMBHANE ' (the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* " agent ") after (the verbal bases) *gṛdh-* " to desire " and *vañc-* " to move " (ending in the causative suffix *Ṇi*), to express the sense of deceiving '.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 3.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' (here *dhātvoḥ*, with the required *vibhaktivipariṇāma* see Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 224) see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *ṇeḥ* 'after (a base ending in *ṆI*)' (here *ṇyoḥ*, with the required *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) is continued from P. 1.3.67.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*ṇyoḥ dhātvoḥ*) *gṛdhivañcyoḥ pralambhane*. The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya bhīsmyor hetubhaye* is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *pralambhane* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

4, The two verbal bases have been stated in a form ending in tha du. loc./gen. ending *-os*. This is taken to reflect the older use of this ending for the du. abl. See P. 1.3.10, sub 4, on P. 3.2.5. Consequently, the *vibhaktiviparīṇāma* forms of *dhātoḥ* and *neḥ* have been given the same ending.

5. The base *gṛdhU* is mentioned in the *Dhātup.* 4.136 as an *ubhayapadin* base. The verb *vañcU* is mentioned in the *Dhātup.* 1.204 as an *udāttet* base.

The forms *gṛdhi* and *vañci* are quotation forms of the bases concerned by *Vt.* II on P. 3.3.108.

6. The *KV* explains the word *pralambhana* as *visaṃvādana* 'breaking one's word', or *mithyāphalākhyāna* 'holding out false hopes to a person'.

7. The *KV* explains that the *ātm.* endings are added to the two causative bases mentioned even if the conditiou *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* (P. 1.3.72) is not met.

8. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

9. The examples provided by the *KV* are *māṇavakaṃ gardhayate* 'he cheats the boy' and *māṇavakaṃ vañcayate* 'he deceives the boy'.

The counterexamples for the meaning-condition *pralambhane* provided by the *KV* are *śvānaṃ gardhayati* 'he sets on the dog' (?) and *ahiṃ vañcayati* 'he wards off the snake'.

Apparently, the use of the *ātm.* endings is not connected with a clear causative sense, whereas that of the *parasmaipada* endings is.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.3.70 (a) LIYAḤ ' (the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* " agent ") after (the verbal base) *lī-* " to cling to " (ending in the causative suffix *Ṇi*, to express the sense of deceiving) '

1. The rule translated here is not P. 1.3.70 in its traditional wording. We propose to split the rule into two, as follows :

(a) *liyaḥ*

(b) *saṃmānanaśālīnīkaraṇayoś ca*

The reasons for doing so are the same as stated under P. 1.3.21 (a), sub 1. Compare also P. 1.3.61 (a).

2. The function assigned to *ca* in P. 1.3.70 by the *KV* is to ensure the continuation of *pralambhane* from P. 1.3.69. Thus there is no difference between the traditional interpretation and the proposal stated above as far as the continuation of *pralambhane* is concerned.

3. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

4. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* ' after a verbal base ' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *ṇeḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.67. The word *pralambhane* is continued from P. 1.3.69.

5. The *uddeśya* is (*ṇeḥ dhātoḥ*) *liyaḥ* (*pralambhane*). The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya gṛdhivañcyoḥ* is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the (continued) meaning-condition *pralambhane* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

6. As explained by the *KV*, the mention of *lī-* in the rule covers both the verbal base stated as *līN* in the *Dhātup.* 4.31 and the base mentioned as *lī-* in the *Dhātup.* 9.31, since the *sūtra* does not specify.

7. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on P. 1.3.70.

8. The example provided by the *KV* for the condition *pralambhane* is *kas tvām ullāpayate* ' who deceives you ? that is, who gives you a false promise ?

The form *ullāpayate* is derived with the help of P. 6.1.51, 7.3.36 and P. 1.3.70. Again (see under P. 1.3.69, sub 9) the use of the *ātm.* endings is is not connected with a clear causative sense.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.3.70 (b) SAṂMĀNANAŚĀLĪNĪKARAṆAYOŚ CA 'also (the *ātm.* endings in the sense of *kartṛ* " agent " are added after the verbal base *lī-* " to cling to " ending in the causative suffix *ṆiN*), to express the sense of honouring or subduing '

1. For the proposed division of the traditional rule see P. 1.3.70 (a), sub 1.

2. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

3. For the role of *ca* see P. 1.3.61 (b), sub 3.

4 The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base ' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *ṇeḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.67. The word *liyaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.70 (a).

5. The *uddeśya* is (*ṇeḥ dhātoḥ liyaḥ*) *saṃmānanaśālīnīkaraṇayoḥ*. The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya pralambhane* is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi–Bhate 1948, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *saṃmānanaśālīnīkaraṇayoḥ* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

6. The *KV* explains the meaning of the word *saṃmānana* as *pūjana* 'showing honour ' and that of *śālīnīkaraṇa* as *nyagbhāvana* 'causing to bend down '.

7. The examples provided by the *KV* are *jaṭābhir ālāpayate* 'he is shown honour because of his matted hair ' *śyeno vārttikām ullāpayate* 'the hawk subdues the partridge '.

The counterexample for the meaning-condition *saṃmānana*, etc. provided by the *KV* is *bālakam ullāpayati* 'he causes the child to cling to ' (?)

As noted earlier (P. 1.3.69, sub 9; P. 1.3.70 (a), sub 8), the use of the *ātm.* endings is not connected wite a clear causative sense.

8. The *KV* notes that by P. 6.1.51 the substitution of *ā* for the verbal base vowel of *lī* is made optional (*vibhāṣā*). The option is of the *vyavasthitavibhāṣā* type. That is to say, it is a limited option which holds good for certain cases only. As stated by the *KV* the substitution of *ā* is not subject to option, when *lī-* is used in any of the three meanings mentioned by P. 1.3.70 (a) and (b). After all, the substitution is not conditioned by one of these meanings. Therefore when *lī-* is used in one such meaning the substitution invariably applies.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

After the substitution has taken place, the augment *ṭUK* becomes applicable by P. 7.3.36.

1.3.71 MITHYOPAPADĀT KṚÑO 'BHYĀSE 'the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* ("agent") after (the verbal base) *kṛṆ* "to do" (ending in the causative suffix *Ṇi*) having (the word) *mithyā* "incorrectly" as and accompanying word, to express the sense of doing repeatedly'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *ṇeḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.67.

3. The *uddeśya* is *mithyopapadāt* (*ṇeḥ dhātoḥ*) *kṛñoḥ abhyāse*. The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya* (*liyaḥ pralambhane*) *saṃmānaśālīnīkaraṇayoḥ* is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *abhyāse* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

4. The word *upapada* is not used here in its technical sense as defined by P. 3.1.92, but in its ordinary sense of an accompanying word. What is accompanied here is the verbal base *kṛ-*.

5. Since *kṛ-* is a *Ñit-* base, the *ātm.* endings could be had by P. 1.3.72 in the sense of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale*. It follows, as stated by the *KV*, that the *ātm.* endings are added even if the sense of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* is not conveyed.

6. The *KV* explains the word *abhyāsa* as *punaḥ punaḥ karaṇam* 'doing again and again', that is, repetition.

7. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

8. The example provided by the *KV* is *padaṃ mithyākārayate* 'he repeatedly pronounces the word wrongly'. That is to say, he pronounces the word incorrectly more than once, as vitiated by a wrong accent, etc.

The counterexample for the condition *mithyopapadāt* provided by the *KV* is *padaṃ suṣṭhu kārayati* 'he pronounces the word correctly'.

The counterexample for the mention of *kṛ-* in the rule provided by the *KV* is *padam mithyā vācayati* 'he repeatedly utters the word wrongly'.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The counterexample for the condition *abhyāse* provided by the *KV* is *padaṃ mithyā kārayati* 'he mispronounces the word (just once)'.

1.3.72 SVARITAÑITAḤ KARTṚABHIPRĀYE KRIYĀPHALE '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" after (a verbal base) marked with *svarita* "a high – low pitch" or with (the *anubandha*) *Ñ*, provided that the result of the action is meant to benefit the agent'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The word *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *svaritañitaḥ* (*dhātoḥ*). *kartṛabhiprāye kriyāphale*. The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya mithyopapadāt kṛñaḥ abhyāse* is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *kartṛabhiprāye kriyāphale* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

4. The *KV* notes that the word *ṇeḥ* from P. 1.3.67 is discontinued. It is discontinued on the basis of *sāmarthya*, that is, because otherwise the rule wouldn't make sense.

5. The present rule opens a section which ends with P. 1.3.77.

6. The *KV* derives the word *kartṛabhiprāya* in the sense of *kartāram abhipraiti* 'it is intended for the agent'. The *Nyāsa* explains that, taken in this sense, *kartṛabhiprāya* is an *upapada*-cp. by P. 3.2.1. The technical derivation is as follows :

(1) ((*kartṛ* + *am*) + (*abhi* + *sU*) + (*pra* + *sU* + *i*)) + *aṆ* P. 3.2.1

(2) ((*kartṛ* + °) + (*abhi* + °) + (*pra* + °) + *i*)) + *a* P. 2.4.71

(3) *kartṛ* *abhi* + *pra* + *ai* + *a* P. 7.2.115

(4) *kartṛ* + *abhi* *pra* + *āy* + *a* P. 6.1.78

(5) *kartṛ* + *abhi* + *prāya* P. 6.1.101

(6) *kartṛ* + *abhiprāya* P. 6.1.77

kartṛabhiprāya.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

In stage (3) P. 7.2.115 takes precedence over P. 6.1.87 (*pra* + *i*→*pre*), because it is *antaraṅga*. The *upasaragas* are regarded as separate words for purposes of derivation.

7. Kātyāyana has not phrased a *Vt.* on the present rule, but there is a *bhāṣya* by Patañjali. Here Patañjali discusses three points :

a The purpose of the word *svaritañitaḥ*

b. The purpose of *abhi* and *pra* in *abhiprāya*

c. The purpose of the word *kartrabhiprāye*.

The explanation for a. is that actions are always undertaken for a result by an agent. Therefore, from the statement *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* we understand that *ātm.* endings may be added after verbal bases denoting actions whose result may benefit the agent or somebody else. Pāṇini has carefully selected these bases by marking them with either *svarita* or *Ñ* (*Mbh.* I, p. 292, lines 20–23).

With regard to b. Patañjali's explanation is that, if Pāṇini had simply said *kartrāya* (*kriyāphale*) ' (provided that the result of the action) goes to the agent ', we could have added *ātm.* endings only in the case of actions whose result becomes available in the present immediateiy. For *kartrāya*, that is, ((*kartṛ* + *am*) + *i*)) + *aṆ*, compare the *prakriyā* stated under 5. By saying *abhi* (in the sense of *ābhimukhya* ' turning towards ') and *pra* (in the sense of *ādikarman* ' the beginning of an action ') Pāṇini, according to Patañjali, makes it clear that the use of *ātm.* endings is also allowed, when reference is to action whose result lies in the future or whose result came in the past (*Mbh.* I. p. 292, line 26 – p. 293, line 2). Exactly how the use of of *abhi* and *pra* makes this clear Patañjali does not say.

The explanation for c. is that the word *kartrabhiprāye* serves to prevent the addition of *ātm.* endings in expressions like *pacanti bhaktakārāḥ* ' the cooks cook ' *kurvanti karmakārāḥ* ' the labourers work ' and *yajanti yājñikāḥ* ' those who officiate at sacrifices sacrifice ' (*Mbh.* I, p. 293, lines 2-3). But couldn't we say that in these cases also the agent undertakes the action with a view to a beneficial result, and that therefore *ātm.* endings could be used ? Patañjali refutes this objection by saying that, since no action is undertaken without the expectation of a beneficial result, like a gift of cows for those who officiate at sacrifices, or wages for labourers, we have to understand that the *kriyāphala* mentioned in the rule is a *kriyāphala* to a higher degree (*prakarṣagati*). That is to say, it must be such a result which can come to the agent from the action

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

undertaken only, not from any other action (*Mbh.* I, p. 293, lines 5–8). Thus a distinction in results of action is introduced between results proper, like *svarga* 'paradise' in the case of sacrificing, or eating in the case of cooking, and incidental results such as receiving a remuneration.

Kaiyaṭa, at the end of his commentary here, quotes a verse from the *VP* (3.12.16, ed. Abhyankar–Limaye, p. 112) which says

yasyārthasya prasiddhyartham ārabhyante pacādayaḥ /
tat pradhānaṃ phalaṃ teṣāṃ na lābhādi prayojanam //

'the matter for whose accomplishment (the actions of) cooking, etc. (only) are undertaken, that is their main result. To have earnings, etc. is not the aim (for which they are undertakan)'.

8. The *KV* explains that by *kriyāphala* that *phala* is meant for which the *kartṛ* 'agent', which is denoted by the *ātm. lA*-replacement here, undertakes the action. That *phala* is the *pradhānapkala* 'main/principal result'. How do we know this? As stated by the *Nyāsa*, we know this on the strength of Pāṇini's use of the word *phala* in the rule. Strictly speaking, there is no need for mentioning this word, because an action must necessarily have a result. But since Pāṇini mentions the word *phala*, it must have an emphatic value: that *phala* which is pre-eminently the *phala* of the action undertaken. Compare Patañjali's *prakarṣagati*-argument under 7.

9. The examples for *svarita*-marked verbal bases provided by the *KV* are *yajate* 'he sacrifices for his own benefit' (*yajA, Dhātup.* 1.1051) and *pacate* 'he cooks for his own benefit' (*pacI, Dhātup.* 1.187). The examples for *Ñ*-marked bases provided by the *KV* are *sunute* 'he presses (Soma) for his own benefit' (*suÑ, Dhātup.* 5.1) and *kurute* 'he makes (something) for his own benefit' (*ḌUkṛÑ. Dhātup*, 8.10).

The counterexamples for the condition *kartrabhiprāye* provided by the *KV* are *yajanti yājakāḥ* 'the sacrificers sacrifice (for somebody else)', *pacanti pācakāḥ* 'the cooks cook (for somebody else)', and *kurvanti karmakārāḥ* 'the labourers work (for somebody else)'. The *KV* adds that even though here the sacrificial fee and wages may be regarded as a result benefiting the agent, still the action is not undertaken for that purpose.

1.3.73. APĀD VADAḤ '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* " agent ") after (the verbal base) *vad-* " to speak " preceded by (the preverb) *apa* (provided that the result of the action is meant to benefit the agent)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra.* See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P.1.3.12, sub 3. The words *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* are continued from P. 1.3.72.

3. The *uddeśya* is *apād* (*dhātoḥ vadaḥ* (*kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale*). The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya*, *svaritañitaḥ*, is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

4. *Apāt* and *vadaḥ* are two technical ablatives indicating a fixed sequence.

5. The verbal base *vad-* is mentioned as *vadA* in the *Dhātup.* (1.1058) as marked with *udātta* and as *parasmaipadin*.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patanjali on the present rule.

7. The example provided by the *KV* is *dhanakāmo nyāyam apavadate* 'the man greedy for money speaks with disrespect of the law'. The idea is that by speaking disrespectfully of the law the money-grubber expects to be benefited.

The counterexample for the condition *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* provided by the *KV* is *apavadati* 'he speaks ill (of...)'.

1.3.74 ṆICAŚ CA 'also (the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") after (a verbal base ending in the causative suffix) *ṆiC* (provided that the result of the action is meant to benefit the agent)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a vesbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The words *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* are continued from P. 1.3.72.

3. The *uddeśya* is *ṇicaḥ* (*dhātoḥ kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale*). The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya*, *apād vadaḥ*, is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

4. For the function of the word *ca* see P. 1.3.61 (b), sub 3.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

5. The word *ṇicaḥ* is interpreted as *ṇijantāt* ' after (a base) ending in *ṆiC* ', by *PN*, *pb.* 23.

6. The suffix *ṆiC* mentioned here is the one prescribed by P. 3.1.26 in the sense of *hetumat* (an action) possessing a causing agent ', not the *ṆiC* prescribed after class X verbal bases by P. 3.1.25.

7. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

8. The examples provided by the *KV* are *kaṭaṃ kārayate* ' he causes to make a mat for his own benefit ' and *odanaṃ pācayate* ' he causes to cook porridge for his own benefit '.

The counterexample for the condition *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* provided by the *KV* is *kaṭaṃ kārayati parasya* ' he causes to make a mat for somebody else '. The genitive *parasya* is by P. 2.3.50. Literally, the expression says : causes to make a mat which belongs to somebody else.

1.3.75 SAMUDĀÑBHYO YAMO 'GRANTHE ' (the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* " agent ") after (the verbal base) *yam-* " to restrain " preceded by (the preverbs) *sam*, *ud* or *āÑ*, except when (reference is to) a text (provided that the result of the action is meant to benefit the agent) '.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* ' after a verbal base ' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The words *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* are continued from P. 1.3.72.

3. The *uddeśya* is *samudāñbhyaḥ* (*dhātoḥ*) *yamaḥ agranthe* (*kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale*). The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya*, *ṇicaḥ*, is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning-conditions *agranthe* and *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* form part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

4. *Samudāñbhyaḥ* and *yamaḥ* are technical ablatives indicating a fixed sequence.

5. For the construction of the negation in *agranthe* see P. 1.3.20, sub 9.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

7. The *KV* points out that since we can already have the *ātm.* endings for *yam-* preceded by *āÑ*, when used intransitively, by P. 1.3.28, the restatement

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

of *āN* in the present rule must be taken to indicate that here the question is of the transitive use of *āyam–*.

8. The examples provided by the *KV* are *vrīhīn saṃyacchate* 'he gathers up the rice-grains for his own benefit', *bhāram udyacchate* 'he lifts the load for his own benefit' and *vastram āyacchate* 'he stretches the cloth for his own benefit'.

The counterexample for the condition *agranthe* provided by the *KV* is *udyacchati cikitsāṃ vaidyaḥ* 'the physician makes an effort to understand the (treatise on the science of) therapy'.

The counterexamples for the condition *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* provided by the *KV* are *saṃyacchati* 'he collects (for somebody else)', *udyacchati* 'he lifts up (for somebody else)' and *āyacchati* 'he stretches (for somebody else)'.

1.3.76 ANUPASARGĀJ JÑAḤ '(the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") after (the verbal base) *jñā-* "to know" not preceded by a preverb (provided that the result of the action is meant to benefit the agent)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The words *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* are continued from P. 1.3.72.

3. The *uddeśya* is *anupasargāt* (*dhātoḥ*) *jñaḥ* (*kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale*). The *vidheya* is *kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya samudāṅbhyaḥ yamaḥ agranthe*, is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14, sub 3.

4. The term *upasarga* is defined by enumeration, by P. 1.4.58–59. The form *anupasarga* is a *bv.* cp., as stated by the *Nyāsa* here.

5. For the form *jñaḥ* see P. 1.3.44, sub 4.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

7. The *Nyāsa* here notes that the use of *ātm.* endings after *jñā–* when used intransitively has already been covered by P. 1.3.45. It follows that the

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

present rule, apart from being conditioned by *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale*, which P. 1.3.45 is not, deals with the transitive use of *jñā-*.

8. The examples provided by the *KV* are *gāṃ jānīte* 'he knows his cow for his own benefit' and *aśvaṃ jānīte* 'he knows his horse for his own benefit'.

The counterexample for the condition *anupasargāt* provided by the *KV* is *svargaṃ lokaṃ na prajānāti mūḍhaḥ* 'a fool has no understanding of paradise or of earth'.

The counterexample for the condition *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* provided by the *KV* is *devādattasya gām jānāti* 'he knows Devadatta's cow'.

1.3.77 VIBHĀṢOPAPADEṆA PRATĪYAMĀNE '(the *ātm.* endings in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" are) preferably not (added after a verbal base when (the condition *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* "provided that the result of the action is meant to benefit the agent") is understood through an accompanying word'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *ātmanepadam* and *kartari* are continued form P. 1.3.12 and 14 respectively. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The words *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* are continued from P. 1.3.72.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ*) *upapadena* (*kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale iti*) *pratīyamāne*. The *vidheya* is *vibhāṣā kartari ātmanepadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya*, *anupasargāt jñaḥ*, is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

For the question whether the meaning-condition *kartrabhiprāye kriyā-phale* – here referring to itself – forms part of the *uddeśya* or of the *vidheya* see P. 1.3.14 sub 3.

4. For the interpretation of the word *vibhāṣā* see Kiparski 1979, p. 1, and AP I, ad P. 1.1.44, sub 8.

5. The term *upapada* in the rule is explained by the *KV* as *samīpe śrūyamāṇaṃ śabdāntaram* 'a different word which is mentioned nearby'.

6. The *KV* explains that by the rules P. 1.3.72–76 the *ātm.* endings are prescribed when the verb itself makes the idea of *kartrabhiprāye kriyā-phale* manifest. But the present rule is stated to make the addition of *ātm.* endings optional in the sense of a non-preferred option when the idea of

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale is made manifest by a different word from the verbform.

As stated by the *Padamañjarī*, the option laid down by the present rule is of the *aprāptavibhāṣā* type. That is to say, it is an option which we can't have from any other rule. Compare *TA*, P. 249.

7. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

8. The examples provided by the *KV* are *svaṃ yajñaṃ yajati|yajate* ' he sacrifices his own sacrifice ', ' *svaṃ kaṭam karoti | kurute* ' he makes his own mat ' and *svaṃ putram apavadati | apavadate* ' he scolds his own son '. Similar examples are to be stated in connection with each of the five preceding rules. The *Nyāsa* here provides them all.

1.3 78 ŚEṢĀT KARTARI PARASMAIPADAM ' after the remaining (verbal bases) the *parasmaipada* endings (are added) in the sense of *kartṛ* " agent ".

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. For the word *dhātoḥ* supplied on the basis of *sāmarthya* see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *śeṣāt* (*dhātoḥ*). The *vidheya* is *kartari parasmaipadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* and *vidheya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya* and *vidheya* are automatically discontinued. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

4. The word *śeṣa* is defined by the *KV* as *yebhyo dhātubhyo yena viśeṣeṇātmanepadam uktaṃ tato yad anyat sa śesaḥ* ' that is (called) *śeṣa* " remainder " which is different from that after which the *ātm.* endings have been stated by means of a distinctive feature '. The distinctive feature referred to consists in a marker added to a verbal base (P. 1.3.12) or in an *upasarga* (as in P. 1.3.17) or in a particular meaning (as in P. 1.3.20).

The device of *śeṣa* is applied more than once in the *A*. It is a handy device by means of which instances are lumped together which have not been covered so far, that is, by the preceding rules.

5. The word *kartari* has been continued from P. 1.3.14 up to P. 1.3.77 inclusive. Then why the statement of *kartari* in the present rule ? The simple answer is, to make clear that the *parasmaipada* endings are not added in the sense of *bhāva* ' impersonal action ' or *karman* ' action in the passive ' (P. 1.3.13). But tradition has a different answer, for which see below.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

6. Kātyāyana has phrased four *Vts* on the present rule. They all of them deal with the relation of this rule with P. 3.1.87 which prescribes *karmakartṛ-* constructions, for which see P. 1.3.67, sub 10. *Vt.* I means that, if we accept the reading *śeṣāt* in P.1.3.78, the *parasmaipada* endings would become applicable in *karmakartṛ* constructions also. This is not desired. Therefore we must state a prohibition regarding meaning. The meaning concerned is that of *karmakartṛ*. The examples provided by Patañjali are *bhidyate kuśūlaḥ svayam eva* 'the storage chest for grain falls apart of its own' and *chidyate rajjuḥ svayam eva* 'the rope breaks of its own' (Mbh. I, p. 293, lines 12–13).

Vt. II proposes to replace the word *śeṣāt* by *śeṣe* 'in the sense of the remaining'. Reference is to P. 1.3 13, which prescribes *ātm.* endings in the sense of *bhāva* 'impersonal action' or of *karman* 'action in the passive'. Here the remaining sense is that of *kartṛ*. Thus, if P. 1.3.78 is phrased as *śeṣe* (*kartari*), it will exclude the *parasmaipada* endings from being added in *karmakartṛ*– constructions, because these will be covered by P. 1.3.13. Thereby the difficulty pointed out by *Vt.* I is removed. At the same time, another difficulty is created. The examples illustrating the difficulty provided by Patañjali are *āste* 'he sits', *śete* 'he lies', *cyavate* 'he stirs' and *plavante* 'they float'. The bases concerned (*āsA*, *Dhātup.* 2.11; *śīṄ*, *Dhātup.* 2.22; *cyuṄ*, *Dhātup.* 1.1004 and *pluṄ*, *Dhātup.* 1.1007) have been marked with an *anndātta* vowel or with *Ṅ*. Therefore, by P. 1.3.12, they should take *ātm.* endings. But if the word *śeṣāt* is dropped from P. 1.3.78, there is nothing to stop them taking *parasmaipada* endings as well. To exclude this latter possibility, a prohibition of *parasmaipada* endings must be stated with regard to the verbal bases (*prakṛti*) concerned.

Kaiyaṭa briefly explains that P. 1.3.12 is a *pratyayaniyama* 'restriction regarding suffixes', and not a *prakṛtiniyama* 'restriction ragarding verbal bases'. Being a *pratyayaniyama*, P. 1.3.12 allows the *ātm.* endings to be added after bases marked with an *anudātta* vowel or with *Ṅ* only. Thereby nothing is said about *parasmaipada* endings. They have a chance to apply too, for all we know. To prevent this, a prohibition is required.

Vt. III then proposes to read the rule as *śeṣāt śeṣe kartari ātmanepadam-*. That will solve the difficulties pointed out by *Vts.* I and II, but it would make the mention of *kartari* in P. 1.3.78 redundant. The reason is that *śeṣe* is definitely to be understood as *śeṣe kartari*, as desired to exclude the sense of *karmakartṛ*, which comes under P. 1.3.13.

Vt. IV says that the word *kartari* in P. 1.3.78 is required for the next rules. The reason is that in these rules the mention of *śeṣāt śeṣe* must be

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

discontinued. If it were continued, P. 1.3.78 by itself could take care of the cases covered by the next rules. Then, if the word *kartari* is continued in P. 1.3.78 from P. 1.3.14, this would not be sufficient to exclude the *karmakartṛ*-meaning. Patañjali provides the examples *anukriyate svayam eva* 'he repeats after (someone) of his own' and *parākriyate svayam eva* 'he rejects of his own' (*Mbh.* I, p. 291, lines 20–21). That is why one more word *kartari* has been stated in P. 1.3.78. This restatement has a particular force. It makes us understand that what is meant is a *kartṛ* pure and simple, not a *kartṛ* which, in addition, is treated like a *karman*.

Patañjali rejects Kātyāyana's proposal to rephrase the rule. But he accepts *Vt.* IV.

7. The examples provided by the *KV* are *yāti* 'he goes' *vāti* 'it blows', *āviśati* 'he goes towards' and *praviśati* 'he enters', implying verbal bases which are not covered by P. 1 3.12 or 17.

The counterexamples for the condition *kartari* provided by the *KV* are *pacyate* 'it is cooked' and *gamyate* 'it is gone (by somebody)' exemplifying *karmaṇi* and *bhāve* uses respectively.

Finally, the *KV* briefly refers to *karmakartṛ*-constructions and to the meaning assigned to the word *kartari* in the rule by the earlier commentators. See under 6.

8. Since Pāṇini has expressly stated *karmavat* in P. 3.1.87, and thereby required the addition of *ātm.* endings, one fails to see how commentators could have the idea that *parasmaipada* endings would become applicable in *karmakartṛ*-constructions. The discussion seems largely futile.

1.3.79 ANUPARĀBHYĀṂ KṚÑAḤ '(the *parasmaipada* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") after (the verbal base) *kṛÑ-* "to do" preceded by (the preverb) *anu* or *parā*'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra.* See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

The words *parasmaipadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.78. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *anuparābhyāṃ* (*dhātoḥ*) *kṛñaḥ.* The *vidheya* is *kartari parasmaipadam.* By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya śeṣāt* is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

4. In connection with the ending *-bhyām* compare P. 1.3.10, sub 4, on P. 3.2.5.

5. *Anuparābhyām* and *kṛñaḥ* are technical ablatives indicating a fiixed sequence.

6. The verbal base *kṛÑ-* is mentioned as *ḌUkṛÑ* in the *Dhātup.* 8.10. Being marked with *Ñ*, it takes the *ātm.* endings provided that the result of the action is meant to benefit the agent, by P. 1.3.72. According to P. 1.3.32, the base *kṛ-* (in seven specified meanings) takes *ātm.* endings even when the result of the action is not meant to benefit the agent. It follows, as stated by the *KV*, that the present rule is an *apavāda* 'exception' to both P. 1.3.72, and P. 1.3.32.

7. Kātyāyana has phrased four *Vts* on the present rule. *Vt.* I explains that P. 1.3.79 has been phrased because P. 1.3.72 which contains the condition *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* could be construed as a prohibition of *parasmaipada* endings after *kṛ-*.

Vt. II says that in P. 1.3.79 a prohibition of *ātm.* endings should be included, because they have not been prohibited by any other rule. The present rule only prescribes *parasmaipada* endings. Kaiyaṭa explains that P. 1.3.79 is really an instance of *pratiprasava* 're-enforcement', namely, of *parasmaipada* endings, through the cancellation of the prohibition (actually, the restriction) stated by P. 1.3.72, *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale.*

Vt. III rejects the proposal put forward by *Vt.* II. It says that we can have the desired prohibition of *ātm.* endings from the statement of option for *parasmaipada* endings after *dyutādi* bases in P. 1.3.91. The bases referred to form a subdivision of *bhuvādi* (1.777–799). They are marked with an *anudātta* vowel, and therefore take *ātm.* endings by P. 1.3.12. The argument is like this. Since P. 1.3.79 prescribes *parasmaipada* endings (after *kṛ-*) and since P. 1.3.72 allows *ātm* endings for *Ñit*-bases on the condition of *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale*, the result will be option anyway. To have that option, P. 1.3.91 is not required. But this rule can be made purposeful by assuming that it gives us a clue. The clue is that when *parasmaipada* endings are prescribed, *ātm.* endings are disallowed (compare *Mbh.* I, P. 294, line 12).

Vt. IV states another way of rejecting the proposal put forward by *Vt.* II. It says that we can simply phrase a prohibition regarding the restriction concerning *ātm.* endings. Patañjali phrases the prohibition as *svaritañitaḥ kartrabhiprāye kriyāphala ātmanepadaṃ bhavati kartary anuparābhyāṃ kṛño na* 'the *ātm.* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" after bases

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

marked with a *svarita* vowel or with *Ñ*, provided that the result of the action is meant to benefit the agent, but not after (the base) *kṛ-* preceded by *anu* or *parā*' (*Mbh.* I, p. 294, lines 14–15).

Patañjali's objection to the proposal of *Vt.* IV is, of course, that it changes the *sūtra* concerned. Therefore the idea put forward by *Vt.* III seems preferable to the proposal by *Vt.* IV. But then Patañjali has a different solution. The question is, why are *parasmaipada* endings disallowed by P. 1.3.72 ? The answer is that they are blocked by *ātm.* endings. This being so, we will say that *ātm.* endings also can be blocked by *parasmaipada* endings (*Mbh.* I, p. 294, lines 17–19). And so the outcome of the discussion is that P. 1.3.79 is an *apavāda* to whatever rule prescribes *ātm.* endings after *kṛ-*, as stated by the *KV* in less than half a line.

8. The examples provided by the *KV* are *anukaroti* 'he imitates' and *parākaroti* 'he rejects'.

1.3.80 ABHIPRATYATIBHYAḤ KṢIPAḤ '(the *parasmaipada* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") after (the verbal base) *kṣip-* "to throw" preceded by (the preverb) *abhi*, *prati* or *ati*'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *parasmaipadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.78. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *abhipratyatibhyaḥ* (*dhātoḥ*) *kṣipaḥ*. The *vidheya* is *kartari parasmaipadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya*, *anuparābhyāṃ kṛñaḥ*, is automatically discontinued. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

4. *Abhipratyatibhyaḥ* and *kṣipaḥ* are technical ablatives indicating a fixed sequence.

5. The base *kṣip-* is mentioned in the *Dhātup.* 4.14 as marked with an *anudātta* vowel. It therefore takes *ātm.* endings by P. 1.3.12. The present rule states an exception to that.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

7. The examples provided by the *KV* are *abhikṣipati* 'he throws around', *pratikṣipati* 'he throws back' and *atikṣipati* 'he throws much'.

A counterexample for the condition *abhipratyatibhyaḥ* provided by the *KV* is *ākṣipati* 'he objects'.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The counterexamples for the mention of *kartari* in the rule provided by the *KV* is the *karmakartṛ*-construction *abhikṣipyate svayam eva* 'he throws around of his own', by P. 3.1.87. See P. 1.3.78, sub 6, on *Vt.* IV.

1.3.81 PRĀD VAHAḤ '(the *parasmipada* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") after (the verbal base) *vah-* "to carry" preceded by (the preverb) *pra*'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *parasmaipadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.78. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *prād* (*dhātoḥ*) *vahaḥ*. The *vidheya* is *kartari parasmaipadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya*, *abhipratyatibhyaḥ kṣipaḥ*, is automatically discontinued. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

4. *Prāt* and *vahaḥ* are technical ablatives indicating fixed sequence.

5. The base *vah-* is mentioned in the *Dhātup.* 1.1053 as marked with a *svarita* vowel. It therefore takes *ātm.* endings, provided that the result of the action is meant to benefit the agent, by P. 1.3.72. The present rule states an exception to that. Accordingly, *vah-* preceded by *pra* takes *parasmaipada* endings even if the result of the action is meant to benefit the agent.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

7. The examples provided by the *KV* are *pravahati* 'it flows', *pravahataḥ* 'the two of them flow' and *pravahanti* 'they flow'.

The counterexample for the condition *prāt* provided by the *KV* is *āvahate* 'he brings near for his own benefit'.

1.3.82 PARER MṚṢAḤ '(the *parasmaipada* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") after (the verbal base) *mṛṣ-* "to bear with" preceded by (the preverb) *pari*'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The word *parasmaipadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.78. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *parer* (*dhātoḥ*) *mṛṣaḥ*. The *vidheya* is *kartari parasmaipadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya*, *prād vahaḥ*, is automatically discontinued. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

4. *Pareḥ* and *mṛṣaḥ* are technical ablatives indicating a fixed sequence.

5. The base *mṛṣA-* is mentioned in the *Dhātup.* 4.55 as marked with a *svarita* vowel. It therefore takes *ātm.* endings, provided that the result of the action is meant to benefit the agent, by P. 1.3.72. The present rule is an exception to that. Accordingly, *mṛṣ-* preceded by *pari* takes *parasmaipada* endings even if the result of the action is meant to benefit the agent.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali, on the present rule.

7. The examples provided by the *KV* are *parimṛṣyati* 'he becomes angry', *parimṛṣyataḥ* 'the two of them become angry' and *parimṛṣyanti* 'they become angry'.

The counterexample for the condition *pareḥ* provided by the *KV* is *āmṛṣyate* 'he bears with'.

8. At the end of its commentary the *KV* mentions that, according to some grammarians, the word *vahaḥ* from P. 1.3.81 is continued in the present rule. Accordingly, *vah-* preceded by *pari* takes *parasmaipada* endings. The example provided by the *KV* is *parivahati* 'he marries'. Needless to say that the idea of continuing *vahaḥ* in P. 1.3.82 goes against *anuvṛtti* procedure and is wrong.

1.3.83 VYĀṄPARIBHYO RAMAḤ '(the *parasmaipada* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") after (the verbal base) *ram-* "to amuse oneself" preceded by (the preverb) *vi*, *āṄ* or *pari*'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *parasmaipada* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.78. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is *vyāṅparibhyo* (*dhātoḥ*) *ramaḥ*. The *vidheya* is *kartari parasmaipadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya*, *parer mṛṣaḥ*, is automatically discontinued. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

4. *Vyāṅparibhyaḥ* and *ramaḥ* are technical ablatives indicating a fixed sequence.

5. The base *ramU-* is mentioned in the *Dhatup.* 1.906 as marked with an *anudātta* vowel. It therefore takes the *ātm.* endings by P. 1.3.12. The present rule is an exception to that.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

7. The examples provided by the *KV* are *viramati* 'he stops', *āramati* 'he amuses himself' and *pariramati* 'he amuses himself'.

The counterexample for *vyāṅparibhyaḥ* provided by the *KV* is *abhiramate* 'he delights in'.

1.3.84 UPĀC CA 'also (the *parasmaipada* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" after the verbal base *ram-* "to amuse oneself") preceded by (the preverb) *upa*'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *parasmaipadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.78. For the word *dhātoḥ*. 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *ramaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.83.

3. For the function of the word *ca* in the rule see P. 1.3.16, sub 2.

4. The *uddeśya* is *upāt* (*dhātoḥ ramaḥ*). The *vidheya* is *kartari parasmaipadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya*, *vyāṅparibhyaḥ*, is automatically discontinued. Compare Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

5. *Upāt* is a technical ablative.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

7. The examples provided by the *KV* are *devadattam/yajñadattam uparamati* 'he causes Devadatta/Yajñadatta to stop'. The *KV* explains that here *ram-* is used in the sense of *ṆiC*, that is, a causative sense, which is deemed inherent in (*upa-*) *ram-*.

8. The *Nyāsa* here notes that *ram-* preceded by *upa* is used intransitively in the meanings *vināśa* 'to perish' and *nivṛtti* 'to cease'. The examples are *uparatāni* which means *naṣṭāni* 'perished' (ntr. pl.) and *svādhyāyād uparamate* 'he stops studying'. The transitive use of *uparam-* as exemplified by the *KV* is due to the meaning of *ṆiC* which is *antarbhāvita* that is, *buddhyanuveśita* 'mentally attributed' to *uparam-*, not separately conveyed by the suffix *ṆiC* added to this base.

9. The *KV* wonders why P. 1.3.84 has been phrased as a separate rule. Couldn't Pāṇini have included *upa* in the enumeration of preverbs by 1.3.83? The answer is that in the next rule Pāṇini is going to state an option for the use of *parasmaipada* endings which concerns *uparam-* exclusively. That is why.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

1.3.85 VIBHĀṢĀKARMAKĀT '(the *parasmaipada* endings in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" are) preferably not (added after the verbal base *ram*– "to amuse oneself") when used intransitively'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *parasmaipadam* and *kartari* are continued form P. 1.3.78. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *ramaḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.84.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*upād dhātoḥ ramaḥ*) *akarmakāt*. The *vidheya* is *vibhāṣā kartari parasmaipadam*.

4. For the interpretation of the word *vibhāṣā* see, Kiparski 1979, p 1, and *AP* I, ad P. 1.1.44, sub 8.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

6. The example provided by the *KV* is *yāvadbhuktam uparamati*| *uparamate* 'he desisted from as many meals as there were'. As noted by the *Nyāsa* here, *yāvadbhuktam* is an *avyayībhāva* cp. by P. 2.1.8, and the suffix *Kta* has been added by P. 3.3.114.

1.3.86 BUDHAYUDHANAŚAJANEṄPRUDRUSRUBHYO ṆEṆ '(the *parosmaipada* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") after (the verbal bases) *budhA* "to be awake", *yudhA*- "to fight", *naśA*- "to perish" *janA*- "to be born", *iṄ*- "to study", *pru*- "to spring up", *dru*- "to run" and *sru*– "to flow" ending in (the causative suffix) *Ṇi*'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *parasmaipada* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.78. For the word *dhātoḥ* (here *dhātubhyaḥ* with the required *vibhaktivipariṇāma*, see Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 224, sub 18 (b) see P. 1.3.12, sub 3.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātubhyaḥ*) *budha . srubhyo ṇeḥ*. The *vidheya* is *kartari parasmaipadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible *uddeśya*, the previous (part-) *uddeśya*, *upād dhātoḥ ramaḥ*, is automatically discontinued See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p, 271, convention 4. The words *vibhāṣā* and *akarmakāt* in P. 1.3.85 are discontinued in the present rule, because P. 1.3.85 is an associative digression, and items belonging to an associative digression are discontinued in the next rule. Compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 197.

4. The bases *budh*–, etc. have been marked with an *anudātta* vowel, or have their vowel marked with *anudātta*, or have been marked with *Ṅ* in the

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Dhātupāṭha. Therefore all of them come under P. 1.3.12 and take *ātm.* endings accordingly.

According to P. 1.3.74, bases in *ṆiC* take ātm. endings provided that the result of the action is meant to benefit the agent. In this respect P. 1.3.86 states an exception for the eight bases mentioned.

5. The words *budha...srubhyaḥ* and *ṇeḥ* in the rule may be taken as two separate ablatives indicating a fixed sequence, as '(added) after *Ṇi* (added) after (the verbal bases) *budha-* and *sru* '. That would save the trouble of interpreting *ṇeḥ* as *ṇijantāt* (*dhātoḥ*) by *PN, pb.* 23, and by subsequently interpreting *ṇijantāt* (*dhātoḥ*) as *ṇijantebhyaḥ* (*dhātubhyaḥ*) ' after the verbal bases...ending in *ṆiC* '. The same interpretation may be adopted in P. 1.3.87, *nigaraṇacalanārthebhyaḥ* (*ṇeḥ*) ' after *Ṇi* (added) after (verbal bases) having the sense of *nigaraṇa* and *calana* ', but it would seem less plausible in connection with P. 1.3.88 (*ṇeḥ dhātoḥ*) *aṇāv akarmakāt*...To have a uniform interpretational pattern for the three rules concerned, the traditional interpretation as stated by the *KV* is therefore followed.

6. The present rule opens a small section dealing with *parasmaipada* endings for causative bases. It ends with P 1.3.89.

7. Kātyāyana has not phrased any *Vt.* on the present rule, but there is a brief, one-line *bhāṣya* by Patañjali. Here he raises the question why among the bases enumerated, mention is made of *akarmaka* ' intransitive ' bases. The bases concerned are *yudh-*, *naś-* and-jan. They could be covered by P. 1.3.88. The answer is that they can be *sakarmaka* ' transitive ' and may have an agent which is *acittavat* ' not endowed with consciousness '. Kaiyaṭa here explains that intransitive bases may become transitive due to a preverb or even without a preverb due to their use in a different meaning or because a causative meaning is inherent in them.

8. The examples provided by the *KV* are *bodhayati* ' he causes to be awake '. *yodhayati* ' he causes to fight ', *nāśayati* ' he causes to perish ', *janayati* ' he causes to be born ', *adhyāpayati* ' he causes to study ', *prāvayati* ' he causes to spring up ', *drāvayati* ' he causes to run ' and *srāvayati* ' he causes to flow '.

9. The *KV* following Patañjali notes that out of the bases enumerated here those which are intransitive would have taken *parasmaipada* endings by P. 1.3.88 provided that the agent is endowed with consciousness. Therefrom it is inferred that, by the present rule, these intransitive bases take *parasmaipada* endings even when the agent is not endowed with consciousness.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The examples provided by the *KV* are *bodhayati padmam* '(the sun) causes the lotus to wake up', *yodhayati kāṣṭhāni* 'causes the sticks to fight/ strike against each other', *nāśayanti duḥkham* 'they cause pain to disappear', *janayanti sukham* 'they cause happiness to originate'.

1.3.87 NIGARAṆACALANĀRTHEBHYAŚ CA 'also (the *parasmaipada* endings in the sense of *kartṛ* 'agent" are added) after (verbal bases) having the sense of swallowing or moving to and fro when ending in (the causative suffix) *Ṇi*'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1

2. The words *parasmaipadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.78. For the word *dhātoḥ* (here *dhātubhyaḥ* with the required *vibhaktivipariṇāma*; see Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 224, sub 18 (b)) see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *ṇeḥ* is continued from P. 1.3.86.

3. For the function of the word *ca* in the rule see P. 1.3.16, sub 2.

4. The *uddeśya* is *nigaraṇacalanārthebhyaḥ* (*dhātubhyaḥ*) *ṇeḥ*. The *vidheya* is *kartari parasmaipadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the, previous (part-) *uddeśya*, *budha...srubhyaḥ* is automatically discontinued. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

5. For the translation adopted see P. 1.3.86, sub 5,

6. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

7. The *KV* explains the word *nigaraṇa* as *abhyavahāra* 'taking food' and *calana* as *kampana* 'shaking'.

8. The examples provided by the *KV* for the category *nigaraṇārtha* are *nigarayati* 'he causes to swallow', *āśayati* 'he causes to eat' and *bhojayati* 'he causes to consume'. The examples for the category *calanārtha* provided by the *KV* are *calayati* 'it causes to shake', *copayati* 'it causes to move' and *kampayati* 'it causes to shake'.

9. The *KV* notes that the present rule deals with transitive bases the agent of which is not endowed with reason. Otherwise the expressions envisaged by P. 1.3.87 could have been covered by P. 1.3.88, as the *Nyāsa* here points out.

10. The *KV* finally mentions an abbreviated version of what is mentioned by Patañjali as the statement of another grammarian. See *KARA, Bh.* No 10 on P. 1.4.52. The abbreviated version says *adeḥ pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ* 'a prohibition should be stated for (the causative base) *adi* "to cause to eat".

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The example provided by the *KV* and borrowed from Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 237, line 15) is *atti devadattaḥ* 'Devadatta eats' (non-causative) and *ādayate devadattena* 'he causes Devadatta to eat' (causative). Here two points are made. First, the *parasmaipada* endings are not added because of the prohibition (abbreviated version). Secondly, the designation *karman* (by P. 1.4.52) is not applied to the word *devadatta*, by *Vt.* 5 on P. 1.4.52,

1.3.88 AṆĀV AKARMAKĀC CITTAVATKARTṚKĀT '(the *parasmaipada* endings are added in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent") after (a verbal base ending in the causative suffix) *Ṇi* which when (the base) does not end in *Ṇi* is intransitive and has an agent endowed with a thinking mind'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *parasmaipadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.78. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *ṇeḥ* interpreted as *ṇijantāt* 'after (a verbal base) ending in *ṆiC*' by *PN pb.* 23, is continued from P. 1.3.86.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*ṇer dhātoḥ*) *aṇāv akarmakāt cittavatkartṛkāt*. The *vidheya* is *kartari parasmaipadam*. By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya*, *nigaraṇacalanārthebhyaḥ*. is automatically discontinued. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

4. The form *aṇi* is used in three rules in the A., P. 1.3.66, the present rule, and in P. 1.4.52 in the cp. *aṇikartṛ*. When taken as a *tp.* cp., *aṇi* means 'other than (the suffix) *Ṇi* (*C*)'. Here *PN*, *pb.* 23 can be applied. That gives us the meaning 'other than what ends in (the suffix) *Ṇi* (*C*)', that is, *aṇyanta*. When taken as a *bv.* cp., *aṇi* means 'not containing (the suffix) *Ṇi* (*C*)'. Reference is to a wordform, in particular, a verbal base (*dhātu*). Again *PN*, *pb.* 23 can be applied. That gives us the meaning 'not ending in (the suffix) *Ṇi* (*C*)', that is, *aṇyanta*.

The form *aṇau* is best taken as a loc. abs., 'when there is no (form ending in) *Ṇi*'.

5, In P. 4.2.47 the elephant is mentioned (with the cow) as a being which is different from what is *acitta*. In other words, it is *sacitta* 'endowed with *citta*'. Here *citta* may be rendered by 'consciousness'. But, if the *KV* is correct in presenting *ārohayamāṇam prayuñkte*, *ārohayate* (for which see under 8) as a counterexample for P. 1.3.88) the elephant must be *acittavat*. Therefore, in the translation adopted above, *citta* has been rendered as 'thinking mind'.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

6. For the translation of the rule adopted above see P. 1.3.86, sub 5.

7. Kātyāyana has phrased two *Vts* on the present rule. *Vt.* I deals with *curādi* verbal bases. It says that in P. 1.3.88 statement should be included to the effect that *parasmaipada* endings must be added after *ṆiC*-containing *curādi* bases when ending in the causative suffix *ṆiC*. Patañjali provides the example *cetayamānaṃ prayojayati*, cetayati ' (in the sense of) *cetayamānaṃ prayojayati* " he instigates the thinking one " (we derive) *cetayati* ' (*Mbh.* I, p, 295, line 1).

The verbal base *cit-* has been mentioned in the *Dhātup.* (10.135) as a *curādi* base which takes *ātm.* endings. Being a *curādi* base, it takes the non-causative suffix *ṆiC* by P. 3.1.25 without change of meaning. To have a *curādi* base express a causative meaning, we have to add the causative suffix *ṆiC* by P. 3.1.26. Subsequently, the non-causative *ṆiC* is deleted by P. 6.4.51. That gives us the causative stage *cit* + *Ṇic* + *lAṬ*. Now P. 1.3.88 says that *parasmaipada* endings are to be added to a causative base, if this base in its non-*Ṇi* stage is intransitive and has an agent endowed with consciousness. But then what about *curādi* bases which have no non-*Ṇi* stage? That is why a separate provision is required.

Vt. II says that we can manage by reading the rule as *atasmin ṇau* ' when that (suffix) *Ṇi* is not there ', instead of *aṇau*. As explained by Kaiyaṭa here, reference is to the *hetumat ṆiC*. Therefore the rule comes to mean *ahetumaṇṇyanto yo ' karmakāś cittakartṛkāś ca tasmād dhetumaṇṇyantāt parasmaipadaaṃ bhavati* ' the *parasmaipada* endings are added after that verbal base ending in the causative suffix *ṆiC* which when not ending in the causative suffix *ṆiC* was intransitive and having an agent endowed with a thinking mind '.

Patañjali's objection is that *Vt.* II changes the text of the rule. He argues that the word *aṇau* in the rule refers to that suffix *ṆiC* before whose addition there was a *karman* ' object ' or agent, going by the conditions stated by P. 1.3.88. In any case, before the addition of the *hetumat* suffix *ṆiC* in *cetayati* there was no *karman*. So that must be the suffix *ṆiC* meant by *aṇau* in the rule (*Mbh.* I, p. 295, lines 9–10).

8. The *KV* provides the paired examples *āste devadattaḥ* ' Devadatta sits '– *āsayati devadattam* ' he causes Devadatta to sit ' and *śete devadattaḥ* ' Devadatta lies '– *śāyayati devadattam* ' he causes Devadatta to lie down '.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The *KV* notes that, according to some, the expression *cetayamānaṃ prayojayati*, *cetayate* (same meaning as stated under 6; but note the *ātm.* ending in *cetayate*) is a counterexample for the condition *aṇau* in the rule. Apparently these grammarians are of the opinion that *aṇau* also excludes the suffix *ṆiC* added in *curādi* bases. According to the *KV*, this is wrong. The reason is that P. 1.3.86 deals with the causative suffix *ṆiC*. Therefore, if a negation of *Ṇi* (*C*) is mentioned in P. 1.3.88 which is close to P. 1.3.86, the *ṆiC* negated can only be that same causative suffix. Therefore the correct form can only be *cetayati*, by P. 1.3.88, and thus the expression becomes an example for this rule, not a counterexample. The proper counterexample for *aṇau* in P. 1.3.88, according to the *KV* is *ārohayamāṇaṃ prayuṅkte ārohayate* '(in the sense of) *ārohayamāṇaṃ prayuṅkte* "he prompts the one which is caused to mount" (we derive) *ārohayate*'. As explained by the *Nyāsa* here, this is a double causative, in which the causative suffix *ṆiC* has been added twice. The first suffix *ṆiC* has been deleted by P. 6.4.51. The point of the peculiar meaning-derivation is that in the *aṇī* stage, before the second suffix *ṆiC* was added, the non-*Ṇi* base in not *akarmaka*, and has an agent which is *acittavat*, namely, the elephant in both cases. Therefore it is a good counterexample for *aṇau* in P. 1.3 88. The *ātm.* ending in *ārohayate* is added by P. 1.3.74.

The counterexample for the conditon *akarmakāt* provided by the *KV* is *kaṭam kurvāṇaṃ prayojayati kārayate* '(in the sense of) *kaṭaṃ kurvāṇaṃ prayojayati* "he prompts the one who makes a mat" (we derive) *kārayate*'. Here the *aṇyanta* base represented by *kaṭaṃ kurvāṇam* is clearly *sakarmaka*. The *ātm.* ending in *kārayate* is added by P. 1.3.74.

The counterexample for the condition *cittavatkartṛka* provided by the *KV* is *śuṣyanti vrīhayaḥ* 'the paddy dries' and *śoṣayate vrīhīn ātapaḥ* 'the heat of the sun causes the paddy to dry'. Although *śuṣ-* is used intransitively in the non-*Ṇi* stage as demonstrated by the first expression, it does not have a *cittavat* agent. The *ātm.* ending in *śoṣayate* is added by P. 1.3.74.

1.3.89 NA PĀDAMYĀṄYAMĀṄYASAPARIMUHARUCINṚTIVADAVASAḤ '(the *parasmaipada* endings in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" are) not (added) after (the verbal bases) *pā-* "to drink", *dam-* "to keep under control", *āyam-* "to stretch", *āyas-* "to exert oneself", *parimuh-* "to be bewildered", *ruc-* "to shine", *nṛt* "to dance", *vad-* "to speak" and *vas-* "to dwell" when ending in (the causative suffix) *Ṇi* (*C*)'

1. This is a *pratiṣedhasūtra*. It lays down a prohibition of what was prescribed by the preceding rules. The prohibition concerns the use of the

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

parasmaipada endings for causative bases. Accordingly, the bases enumerated take *ātm.* endings, as prescribed by P. 1.3.74.

2. The words *parasmaipadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.78. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. *Vibhaktiviparipṇāma* in the sense of a change in grammatical number (see Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 224, sub (18 b)) is not required, because the form *pādamy...vasaḥ* itself is a sg.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*ṇer dhātoḥ*) *pādamy...vasaḥ*. The *vidheya* is *na kartari parasmaipadam*. The words *aṇau akarmakāt acittavatkartṛkāt* from P. 1.3.88 are discontinued on the basis of *sāmarthya*. That is to say, they do not make sense in the present rule. Compare Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 46.

4. The form *pādamy...vasaḥ* is a *samāhāradvandva* used in the neuter sg. by P. 2.4.17.

5. The *Nyāsa* explains that the anubandha *Ṅ* in *āṄ* serves to distinguish the *upasarga ā* from any other *ā*. Compare *AP* I, P. 1.1.14, sub 4.

6. The *KV* points out that what the present rule does is to state a prohibition of the *parasmaipada* endings prescribed by P. 1.3.87 and 88. The verb *pā-* comes under the category *nigaraṇārtha* 'having the sense of swallowing', whereas the verb *nṛt-* comes under the category *calanārtha* 'having the sense of moving to and fro', both mentioned by P. 1.3.87. Moreover, as pointed out by the *Nyāsa* here, *nṛt-* is a *cittavatkartṛka* verbal base, and therefore could be covered by P. 1.3.88.

The prohibition of the *parasmaipada* endings results in the application of *ātm.* endings by P. 1.3.72. But this rule contains the proviso *kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale*. Accordingly, forms like *pāyayate* take on the meaning 'he causes to drink for his own benefit'. On the other hand, if this shade of meaning is not desired to be expressed, we will have the *parasmaipada* endings again, by P. 1.3.78.

7. Kātyāyana has phrased one *Vt.* on the present rule. It says that the base *dheṬ-* 'to suck' (*Dhātup.* 1.951) is to be included in the *pā-*, etc. list. Patañjali provides the example *dhāpayete śiśum ekaṃ samīcī* ('the night and morning') jointly suckle the single cub' (ṚgV. 1.96.5).

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

8. The *KV* provides the examples *pāyayate* 'he causes to drink', *damayate* 'he causes to keep under control', *āyāmayate* 'he causes to stretch', *āyāsayate* 'he causes to exert himself', *parimohayate* 'he causes to be bewildered', *racayate* 'he causes to shine' *nartayate* 'he causes to dance', *vādayate* 'he causes to speak' and *vāsayate* 'he causes to dwell'.

The *Nyāsa* explains that in *pāyayate* the augment *yUK* is added by P. 7 3 37, and that the verbal base vowel is shortened by P. 6.4.92 after having been lengthened by P. 7.2.116. The *KV* notes that the designation *mit* does not apply to *yam-* (*Dhātup.* 1.871). Therefore here the verbal base vowel is lengthened.

9. The *KV* mentions Kātyāyana's *Vt.* together with the example provided by Patañjali.

1.3.90 VĀ KYAṢAḤ '(the *parasmaipada* endings in the sense of *kartṛ* "agent" are) preferably (not added after a verbal base) ending in (the denominative suffix) *KyaṢ*'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra.* See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *parasmaipadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.78. For the word *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal base' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *na* is continued from P. 1.3.89.

3. The *uddeśya* is *kyaṣaḥ* (*dhātoḥ*). The *vidheya* is (*na*) *vā* (*kartari parasmaipadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya*, *pādamy...vasaḥ* is automatically discontinued. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

4. For the continuation of the particle *na* in the present rule which contains the term *vā* see Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 116–117. *Na vā* means *vibhāṣā*, 'by P. 1.1.44. For interpretation of *vibhāṣā* 'preferably not' see Kiparski 1979, p. 1.

The *KV* continues the particle *na*, but does not connect it with *vā*. See under 9.

5. We note that *vā* has been stated at the beginning of the rule. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 244.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

6. The suffix *KyaṢ* has been prescribed by P. 3.1.13 after the noun stems *lohita*, etc. and after stems ending in the suffix *ḌāC*, subject to conditions. It forms a denominative verbal base in the sense of becoming this or that.

The form *kyaṣaḥ* is interpreted to mean *kyaṣantāt* 'after (verbal base) ending in *KyaṢ* ' by *PN*, *pb.* 23.

7. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

8. The *KV* offers the examples *lohitāyati|lohitāyate* 'it becomes red' and *paṭapaṭāyate* 'it makes the sound *paṭ-paṭ*'. The *Nyāsa* explains that lengthening of the vowel in *lohitāyati|te* is by P. 7.4.25. In connection with the *prakriyā* of *paṭapaṭāyate*, the *Nyāsa* successively refers to *Vt.* 8 on P. 8.1.12 (in a changed version of Patañjali's explanation) P 5.4.59 and P. 6.1.100.

According to the interpretation of the rule offered above, the preferred endings are the *ātm.* endings.

9. It is generally accepted that P. 1.3.90 prescribes the optional use of *parasmaipada* endings for verbal bases ending in *KyaṢ*. But apart from that, how do we understand that the same rule allows the use of *ātm.* endings optionally also ? This is the question put at the end of the *KV* commentary here, The difficulty is that the *ātm.* endings prescribed in the section headed by P. 1.3.12 have a well–defined field of application, and within that field of application *KyaṢ-anta* verbal bases do not figure at all.

The answer given by the *KV* comes to this. The immediately preceding rule, P. 1.3.89, states a prohibition of *parasmaipada* endings. It says *na parasmaipadam*. This amouts to the prohibition of what is an *apavāda* 'exception' stated by P. 1.3.87 and 88. As explained by the *Nyāsa*, when an *apvāda* is not applied, the *utsarga* 'general rule' becomes applicable. What is prescribed as the general rule are the *ātm.* endings. Therefore *na parasmaipadam* means *ātmanepadam*. Accordingly, by P. 1.3.90 the *ātm.* endings become optionally available for *KyaṢ-anta* verbs.

The argument could have been put more simply as follows. Since the option is only possible between *parasmaipada* and *ātm.* endings, *na parasmaipadam* can only mean *ātmanepadam*. Of that *ātmanepadam* the present rule says *vā*.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

As regards the optional use of the *parasmaipada* endings, the *KV* finally states that they become applicable by P. 1.3.78.

1.3.91 DYUDBHYO LUṄI '(the *parasmaipada* endings in the sense of *kartṛ* are preferably not added) after (the verbal bases) *dyut-* "to shine", etc., when (the aorist marker) *lUṄ* follows'.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *parasmaipadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.78. For the word *dhātoḥ* (here *dhātubhyaḥ*) with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*; see Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 224, sub (18 b), see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *na* is continued from P. 1.3.89 and the word *vā* from P. 1.3.90.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātubhyaḥ*) *dyudbhyaḥ luṅi*. The *vidheya* is (*na vā kartari parasmaipadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya*, *kyaṣaḥ*, is automatically discontinued. See Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

4. For the continuation of the particle *na* in the present rule see Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 116-17. For the continuation of the word *vā* in the present rule see Joshi-Bhate 1984, p. 70, sub (9). *Na vā* means *vibhāṣā* by P. 1.1.44. For the interpretation of *vibhāṣā* 'preferably not' see Kiparski 1979, p. 1. The *KV* expressly continues the word *vā* but not *na*.

5. Although in the overwhelming majority of cases the word *ādi* is used in the A. to indicate an enumeration of verbal or nominal bases, the plural ending may be used for the same purpose. Compare P. 1.3.92 (*vṛdbhyaḥ*), 2.2.38 (*kaḍārāḥ*), 2.4.31 (*ardharcāḥ*) and 2.4.61 (*taulvalibhyaḥ*). Thus in the present rule *dyudbhyaḥ* amounts to *dyutādibhyaḥ* 'after (the verbal bases) *dyut-*, etc.'. The form *dyutādi* is actually used in P. 3.1.55.

6. *Dyutādi* is a subdivision of *bhuvādi*. The verbs meant are mentioned in the *Dhātup.* 1.707-799 as marked with an *anudātta* vowel. Therefore they take *ātm.* endings by P. 1.3.12. According to the present rule, the *ātm.* endings are preferred in the aorist also.

7. The aor. marker *lUṄ* has been prescribed by P. 3.2.110 in the sense of past time (*bhūte*, P. 3.2.84).

8. There is no bhāṣya by Patañjali on the present rule.

9. The examples provided by the *KV* are *vyadyutat|vyadyotiṣṭa* 'it shone around' and *aluṭhat|aloṭhiṣṭa* 'he struck back' (*luṭhA pratighāte*, *Dhātup.* I.785)

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The derivation of *vyadyotiṣṭa* is as follows :

(1)		*dyutA–*				*Dhātup.* 1.777
(2)	*vi*	+ *dyut*				
(3)	*vi*	+ *dyut*			+ *lUṄ*	P. 3.2.110
(4)	*vi* + *aṬ*	+ *dyut*			+ *lUṄ*	P. 6.4.71
(5)	*vy* + *a*	+ *dyut*			+ *luṄ*	P. 6.1.77
(6)	*vy* + *a*	+ *dyut*		+ *cli*	+ *lUṄ*	P. 3.1.43
(7)	*vy* + *a*	+ *dyut*		+ *sIC*	+ *lUṄ*	P. 3.1.44
(8)	*vy* + *a*	+ *dyut*	+ *iṬ*	+ *s*	+ *lUṄ*	P. 7.2.35
(9)	*vy* + *a*	+ *dyot*	+ *i*	+ *s*	+ *lUṄ*	P. 7.3.86
(10)	*vy* + *a*	+ *dyot*	+ *i*	+ *s*	+ *ta*	P. 3.4.78
(11)	*vy* + *a*	+ *dyot*	+ *i*	+ *ṣ*	+ *ta*	P. 8 3.59
(12)	*vy* + *a*	+ *dyot*	+ *i*	+ *ṣ*	+ *ṭa*	P. 8.4.41

vyadyotiṣṭa.

10. The counterexample for the condition *luṅi* provided by the *KV* is the present tense form *dyotate* ' it shines '.

1.3.92 VṚDBHYAḤ SYASANOḤ ' (the *parasmaipada* endings in the sense of *kartṛ* " agent " are preferably not added) after (the verbal bases) *vṛt* " to exist ", etc.,when (the suffix) *sya* (of the non-periphrastic future and of the conditional) or (the desiderative suffix) *saN* follows '.

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3-17, sub 1.

2. The words *parasmaipadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.78. See further P. 1.3.91, sub 2.

3. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātubhyaḥ*) *vṛdbhyaḥ syasanoḥ*. The *vidheya* is (*na vā kartari parasmaipadam*). By the introduction of a new, incompatible (part-) *uddeśya* the previous (part-) *uddeśya dyudbhyaḥ luṅi*, is automatically cancelled. See Joshi–Bhate 1984, p. 271, convention 4.

4. For the continuation of the words *na* and *vā*, see P. 1.3.91, sub 4. The *KV* continues *vā*, but not *na*.

5. For the meaning to be attached to the plural form *vṛdbhyaḥ* see P. 1.3.91, sub 5.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

6. *Vṛtādi* is a subdivision of *dyutādi*, as noted by the *KV*. The verbs concerned are mentioned in the *Dhātup*. 1.795–799, five verbs in all, and separately enumerated by the *KV*. Being a subclass of *dyutādi*, the *vṛtādi* verbs are marked with an *anudātta* vowel. Therefore they take the *ātm*. endings by P. 1.3.12. According to the present rule, the *ātm*. endings are preferred in the future and in the desiderative also.

7. The suffix *sya* is added before the non-periphrastic future and conditional markers *lṚṬ* and *lṚṄ* by P. 3.1.33. The sense conveyed by *lṚṬ* is *bhaviṣyat* 'future', by P. 3.3.13 (and P. 3.3.3).

The desiderative suffix *saN* is added optionally, that is, preferably (*vā*) by P. 3.1.7 in the sense of wishing, provided that the agent of the action of wishing is the same as that of the action wished for.

8. There is no *bhāṣya* by Patañjali on the present rule.

9. The examples provided by the *KV* for *vṛt-* are *vartsyati|vartiṣyate* 'will exist', *avartṣyat|avartiṣyata* 'would exist' and *vivṛtsati|vivartiṣyate* 'desires to exist'.

The examples for *vṛdh-* 'to grow' are *vartsyati|vardhiṣyati* 'will grow', *avartsyat|avardhiṣyata* 'would grow' and *vivṛtsati|vivardhiṣate* 'desires to grow'.

The derivation of *avartsyat* 'would grow' is as follows :

(1)	*vṛdhU* –	*Dhātup.* 1.796
(2)	*vṛdh* + *lṚṄ*	P. 3.3.139
(3)	*a* + *vṛdh* + *lṚṄ*	P. 6.4.71
(4)	*a* + *vṛdh* + *sya* + *lṚṄ*	P. 3.1.33
(5)	*a* + *vardh* + *sya* + *lṚṄ*	P. 7.3.86
(6)	*a* + *vardh* + *sya* + *ti*	P. 3.4.78
(7)	*a* + *vardh* + *sya* + *t*°	P. 3.4.100
(8)	*a* + *vart* + *sya* + *t*	P. 8.4.55
	avartsyat.	

The addition of the augment *iṬ* (by P. 7.2.35) is specifically prohibited for *vṛtādi* bases by P. 7.2.59.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

The derivation of *vivardhiṣate* ' desires to grow ' is as follows :

(1)		*vṛdhU-*			*Dhātup.* 1.796
(2)		*vṛdh*	+ *saN*		P. 3.1.7
(3)	*vṛdh*	+ *vṛdh*	+ *sa*		P. 6.1.9
(4)	*vardh*	+ *vṛdh*	+ *sa*		P. 7.4.66
(5)	*virdh*	+ *vṛdh*	+ *sa*		P. 7.4.79
(6)	*vi°*	+ *vṛdh*	+ *sa*		P. 7.4.60
(7)	*vi*	+ *vardh*	+ *sa*		P. 7.3.86
(8)	*vi*	+ *vardh* + *iṬ*	+ *sa*		P. 7.2.35
(9)	*vi*	+ *vardh* + *i*	+ *sa*	+ *lAṬ*	P. 3.2.123
(10)	*vi*	+ *vardh* + *i*	+ *sa*	+ *ta*	P. 3.4.78
(11)	*vi*	+ *vardh* + *i*	+ *sa*	+ *te*	P. 3.4.79
(12)	*vi*	+ *vardh* + *i*	+ *ṣa*	+ *te*	P. 8.3.59
	vivardhiṣate				

The counterexample for the condition *syasanoḥ* provided by the *KV* is the present tense form *vartate* ' exists '.

1.3.93 LUṬI CA KḶPAḤ '(the *parasmaipada* endings in the sense of *kartṛ* " agent ") are optionally added after (the verbal base) *kḷp-* " to be fit for " when (the periphrastic future marker) *LUṬ* follows '

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*. See further P. 1.3.17, sub 1.

2. The words *parasmaipadam* and *kartari* are continued from P. 1.3.78. For the word *dhātoḥ* ' after a verbal base ' see P. 1.3.12, sub 3. The word *vā* is continued, as accepted by the *KV*, from P. 1.3.90. For the discontinuation of the word *na* and the translation of *vā* see below.

3. The *uddeśya* is *luṭi* (*dhātoḥ*) *kḷpaḥ*. The *vidheya* is (*vā kartari parasmaipadam*).

4. The verbal base *kḷp-* (*kṛpU*, *Dhatup.* 1.779) is the last one in the enumeration of *vṛtādi* bases given by the *KV* under P. 1.3.92. Accordingly, we can have the optional prescription of *parasmaipada* endings when *sya* or *saN* follows by P. 1.3.92 itself. *KṛpU* has been marked with an *anudātta* vowel. Therefore it takes the *ātm.* endings by P. 1.3.12. Consequently, the optional prescription of *parasmaipada* endings makes sense.

5. Kātyāyana has not phrased any *Vt.* on the present rule, but there is a *bhāṣya* by Patañjali. The *bhāṣya* is wholly devoted to the discussion of

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

the purpose of the word *ca* in the rule. Patañjali's conclusion is that *ca* is not required for purposes of *anuvṛtti*. In fact, all words *ca* in the A. are rejected by Patañjali (*Mbh*. I, p. 295, lines 17–18) that is, for purposes of *anuvṛtti*.

The *KV* follows Patañjali by saying that the word *ca* here is not required for the continuation of *syasonoḥ* from P. 1.3.92.

The only thing which can be said of *ca* in the present rule is that it is a handy device to add a rule, at a later stage of composition, to an already existent text. We note that P. 1.3.93 comes at the end of a *pāda*. For the rest, *ca* is redundant. Compare Joshi–Bhate, " The Role of the Particle *ca* in the Interpretation of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* " *Proceedings* 1983, p. 223. Accordingly, it has been left untranslated in the rendering of the rule stated above.

6. The formation of the periphrastic future (*LUṬ*) is mentioned in the A. by P. 2.4.85. As stated in *AP* I. p. 10 (under P. 1.1.6), the formation of this tense may not have formed part of the original body of rules of the A. It is noted that P. 2.4.85 also comes at the end of a *pāda*, without any connection with what precedes and follows. Whitney, in his *Sanskrit Grammar*, para. 946, observes that the tense-use begins, but rather sparingly, in the Brāhmaṇas (from which about thirty forms are quotable). P. 8.1.28 prescribes that a finite verb loses its accent when preceded by a non-finite verb. The immediately following rule, P. 8.1.29, makes an exception for *LUṬ* formations. Moreover, in the A. all suffixes added to *lakāras* are dealt with in the third *adhyāya*, whereas the substitutions for the *lakāras* have been stated in *adhyāya* 3, *pāda* 4. All of this appears to point to one conclusion, namely, that the rules in the A. which deal with *LUṬ* are later additions to the original text. One such later addition it may be assumed, is the present rule, P. 1.3.93.

7. If the assumption that P. 1.3.93 is a later addition is correct, this cannot but have implications for the translation of *vā* and for the discontinuation of the word *na*. In later, but still pre-Kātyāyana tradition the original sense of the terms *vā*, *vibhāṣā* and *anyatarasyām* must have been lost. Compare Kiparski, P. 11–13. It seems therefore a fair assumption that to the grammarian or grammarians who phrased P. 1.3.93 that *vā* means ' optionally ' indiscriminately. It also seems fair to assume that at some stage in tradition the word *na* was discontinued from P. 1.3.90 onwards, although it is difficult to determine the relative age of this tradition for lack of evidence. In any case, the *KV* discontinues *na*. These are the considerations which led us to translate *vā* in the present rule as ' optionally ' and to discontinue *na*. For the rare attestation of *ātm*. *LUṬ* forms see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, para. 947 a.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

8. The examples provided by the *KV* for the future *sya* forms and the *LUṬ*- forms are *kalpsyati|kalptā*, *kalpiṣyate|kalpitā* all of them meaning 'he will be fit for'. The examples for desiderative formations are *ciklpsati|cikalpiṣate* 'he desires to be fit for'.

The derivation of *kalptā* is as follows :

(1)	*kṛpU* –			*Dhātup.* 1.799
(2)	*kṛp*		+ *LUṬ*	P. 3.3.15
(3)	*kṛp*		+ *tiP*	P. 3.4.78
(4)	*kṛp*		+ *Ḍā*	P. 2.4.85
(5)	*kṛp*	+ *tās* +	*ā*	P. 3.1.31
(6)	*karp*	+ *tās* +	*ā*	P. 7.3.86; 1.1.51
(7)	*karp*	+ *i*° +	*ā*	P, 6.4.143
(8)	*kalp*	+ *i* +	*ā*	P. 8.2.18
	kalptā			

As stated by the *Nyāsa*, P. 7.2.60 prohibits the addition of the augment *iṬ* before *tās* in the case of *klp*-. In the *ātm.* form *kalpitā* the augment *iṬ* is added by P. 7.2.35.

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

INDEX OF SANSKRIT TERMS

The Index contains Sanskrit terms which have been defined or discussed in the Introduction, Translation and Notes. Free numbers refer to the pages. The words are listed in the order of the Sanskrit syllabary.

akarmaka 52, 154
aṅga 91
aṅgavikṣepa 52
aṅgasya 25, 91
acitta 156
acittavat 154, 158
ajām nayati grāmam 65
aṇayanta 156
aṇi 110, 156
aṇau, 158
atadguṇasaṃvijñāna 105
atideśasūtra 97, 102
atti devadattaḥ 156
athuC 13
adarśanam 16
adeḥ pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ 155
adhikaṃ kāryam 26
adhikaḥ kāraḥ 26
adhikāra 24, 25
adhyavasyati 74
adhyāpayati 154
adhyāya 1
adhyāropitapreṣaṇapakṣa 130
anadhyāne 109, 111, 112, 113
anantara 18
anavakāśatva 30
anavanakauṭilayoḥ 108
anavane 108
anādhyāne, 75, 132
anāsyaviharaṇe 41
anitya 12, 92
anukaroti 149
anukūla 126
anuktasamuccayārtha 38
anukriyate svayam eva 147
anukrīḍate 45
anucikīrṣati 99, 102
anudātta 30, 99, 101, 149
anudeśin 20
anunāsika 8
anuprayujyate 104
anuprayoga 103
anubandha, 7, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19
anubandhanimittaka 19
anuvadate kaṭhaḥ kalāpasya 78
anuvadate maudgaḥ paippalādasya 78
anuvṛtti 11, 24, 25
anūrdhvakarmaṇi 49
antargaṇa 1, 92
antaraṅgatva 94
antarātman 113
anyatarasyām 166
anyonya 37
anyonyasya vyatilunanti 38
anvaya 5
anvayavyatireka 5
apakarṣa 24
aparājaya 62
aparedyur upakrāmati 71
apavadati 141
apavāda 17, 149, 161
apavādanyāya 17
apaskirate kukkuṭo bhakṣārthī 45
apaskirate vṛṣabho hṛṣṭaḥ 45

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

apaskirate śvāśrayārthi 46
apahnava 73
apahnave 72, 73
apāṇinīya 1
apādāna 26
apratibandha 67
aprasiddhi 17
aprāptavibhāṣā 72, 145
abhikṣipati 149
abhikṣipyate svayam eva 150
abhibhava 62
abhiramate 152
abhividhi 42
abhihita 32
abhyavahāra 155
abhyāse 137
abhyupagama 80
abhrā ā apāḥ 8
amṛta 96
ayajñapātreṣu 106, 107
ayaṃ panthāḥ sāketam upatiṣṭhate 51
ayam panthāḥ srughnam upatiṣṭhate 51
ariṣyati 57
arudhat 14
arautsit 15
arkam upatiṣṭhate 50
arthataḥ 23
artham adhikaroti 62
aluṭhat 162
aloṭhiṣṭa 162
avakṣepaṇa 60
avatiṣṭhate 47
avatsā akiśorā akarabhā abarkarā 108
avadhi 98
avana 108
avayava 18
avayavin 18
avartṣyat 164
avartiṣyata 164
aśatsyat 94
aśiṣṭavyavahāra 83
aśvārohān upatiṣṭhate 50
aśvena saṃcarate 82
as- 3, 47
asiddha 29
asmin śāstrāṇi kramante 67
ahiṃ vañcayati 134
ā 41
ākusmayate 100
ākramati dhūmo harmyatalāt 69
ākramati māṇavakaḥ kutupam 69
ākrīḍate 44
ākhyā 48
āgama 9
āgamayasva tāvan māṇavaka 45
āgamau guṇavṛddhī 47
āgneyyāgnīdhram upatiṣṭhate 50
ācārya-karaṇa 64, 65
ācikraṃsate 101
ātmanepada 1, 26, 27
ādayate devadattena 156
ādi 3, 162
ādikarman 139
ādityam upatiṣṭhate 50
ādityaṃ paśyati 119
ādeśa 9
ādhyāna 75
ānantarya 18
ābhimukhya 139
āmṛṣyate 151
āmpratyaya 103
āmpratyayavat 103, 104
āyacchati kūpād rajjum 56
āyacchate 55
āyacchate pāṇi 56
āyāmayate 160
āyāsayate 160
āruhyate 121
āruhyate hastī svayam eva 122, 123, 125
ārohanti hastinam hastipakāḥ 111, 114, 116 121, 123, 129, 131
ārohayate 129, 156, 158
ārohayate hastī svayam 114
ārohayate hastī svayam eva 114, 122, 123, 124, 129
ārohayanti hastinam hastipakāḥ 122, 123
ārohayanti hastī hastipakān 129, 130
ārohayamāṇam prayuṅkte 156, 158
ārohayamāṇo hastī bhītān secayati mūtreṇa 131

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

ārohayamāṇo hastī sādhv ārohati 130
ārohayamāṇo hastī sthalam ārohayati 111
ārohayamāṇo hastī sthalam ārohayati manuṣyān 131
ārdhadhātuka vikaraṇa 27
āvahate 150
āviśati 147
āvṛtti 10
āśayati 155
āśirliṅ 96
āśuśrūṣati 88
āsayati 100
āsayati devadattam 157
āsisiṣate 101
āste 146
āsyate puruṣābhyām 33
āsyate puruṣaiḥ 33
āhate 55
it 7, 11, 14
itaretara 37
itaretarasya vyatilunanti 38
itaretarāśraya 9, 10
iticet-vārttika 111
ir 14
īṣat 41
īhā 2, 49
īhāṃ cakre 105
īhām āsatuḥ 104
utkaṇṭhāsmaraṇam 75
utkurute 61
uttapati suvarṇam suvarṇakāraḥ 54
uttapate 54
uttapate pāṇi 54
uttapate pṛṣṭham 54
uttiṣṭhati senā 49
utsañjana 64, 65
utsarga 161
utsarga-apavāda 28
utsāha 68
udākurute 61
udāttet 55
udumbhaṃ cakāra 103, 104
udgamana 68
udgamane 69
uddeśin 20
uddeśya 1, 6, 8, 12, 24
udyacchati cikitsāṃ vaidyaḥ 143
upakramate 68
upakramate bhoktum 71
upadeśa 6, 7, 9, 13, 16, 19, 36, 42
upapada 21, 38, 137, 144
upamantraṇa 75
upayoga 60
upalabdhi 17
upalambhana 46
upaśleṣa 51
upasaṃbhāṣā 75
upasiñcanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ 114, 117
upasecayate hastī svayam eva 114
upasarga 22, 41, 73, 91, 143
upasarga parā 41
upasargeṇa dhātvartho balād anyatra nīyate 60
ubhau lokau saṃcarasi imaṃ ca devala 81
ūhāṃ cakre 105
ṛkṣv asya kramate buddhiḥ 67
ekaśeṣa 10
ekānta 17
edhodaka 61
edho dakasyopaskurute 61
aindryā gārhapatyam upatiṣṭhate 50
odanaḥ pacyate svayam eva 118
odanaṃ pācayate 142
odanasya pūrṇāś chāttrā vikurvate 64
aupadeśikaprayogika 8
auṣadhasyānujijñāsate 87
kaṭa ātmānaṃ kārayati 129
kaṭa ātmānaṃ kārayati devadattena 129
kaṭaḥ kaṭaṃ kārayati devadattena 129
kaṭaḥ kārayati devadattena 129
kaṭaḥ kārayate svayam eva 128
kaṭaḥ kriyate 33
kaṭaṃ karoti 61, 119
kaṭaṃ kārayati parasya 142
kaṭaṃ kārayate 110, 142
kaṭaṃ kurvāṇaṃ prayojayati 158
kaṇḍūyati 13
kampana 155

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

kampayati 155
karaṇa 7
kareṇur ārohayate niṣādinam 114
kartṛ 32, 33, 34
kartṛsthakriyaka 113, 120
kartṛsthabhāvaka 113, 120, 125
kartrabhiprāya 138
kartabhiprāye kriyāphalam 40, 110
kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale 42, 59, 61, 73, 99, 103, 105, 137, 144, 159
karmakarān upanayate 65
karmakarān upavadate 76
karmakartṛ 32, 54, 55, 110, 113, 118, 121, 122, 123, 124, 128, 146, 147, 150
karmakāraka 122, 125
karman 6, 30, 31, 32, 33, 49, 63, 110, 111, 112, 115, 118, 121, 125, 128, 157
karmapravacanīya 41, 45
karmavat 147
karmavyatihāra 35, 36
karmavyatihāre 34, 35, 37
karmasthakriyaka 113, 119, 120, 122, 127, 128
karmasthakriyā 119
karmasthabhāvaka 113
kalpita 167
kalpiṣyate 167
kalptā 167
kalpsyati 167
kavarga 15
kas tvām ullāpayate 135
kāyaparispandātmikā 49
kāraka 3, 63
kārakāṇāṃ pravṛttiviśeṣaḥ kriyā 3
kārakāntaraviniyogalakṣaṇa 123
kārayate 158
kārayate kaṭaḥ svayam eva 129
kit 18
kuñcikayainaṃ bhāyayati 133
kuṭumbe uttiṣṭhate 49
kurute 140
kurvanti karmakārāḥ 139
kulabhāryām upavadate 76
kūjana 45
kulaṃ vyādadāti 43
keśacaṇa 14
kauṭilya 108
Kta 13
Ktri 13
krama 20
kramate 72
krameṇa mauhūrtā mauhūrtena saha vipravadanti 79
kriyate kaṭaḥ 32
kriyate kaṭaḥ svayam eva 128
kriyā 3, 5, 6, 35, 49, 63
kriyāprakāra 3
kriyāphala 139, 140
kriyāvacana 3, 4, 5
kriyāvacano dhātuḥ 2, 3, 5
krodham vinayate 66
kroṣṭā vikurute svarān 63
kva 11
kṣetre vadate 76
gaṅgā yamunām upatiṣṭhate 51
gaṅgāyāṃ gāvaḥ 26
gaḍuṃ vinayati 66
gaṇa 1
gaṇakān upakurute 61
gaṇayati gaṇaḥ svayam eva 112
gaṇayati gaṇaṃ gopālakaḥ 131
gatatācchilya 46
gati 36, 46
gandhana 60
gamayate 147
gāthāḥ prakurute 61
gām āhvayati gopālaḥ 60
girateḥ 80
giraḥ 79
guṇa 6
guruṃ śuśrūṣate 85
guruvacanam uccarate 81
geham uccarate 81
gehe uttiṣṭhate 49
graḥ 79, 80
grāmaṃ sampaśyati 58
ghātayaty ātmā 113
ca 37, 38, 43, 44, 47, 53, 63, 73, 152, 166
cākṣuṣajñānaviṣaya 126
cākṣuṣajñānaviṣayāpattyanukūlavyāpāra 126

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

cākṣuṣajñānānukūlavyāpāra 126
caṇAP 14
calana 154, 155
calanārtha 159
calayati 155
cavarga 14
citta 156
cittavatkartṛka 158, 159
cuñcUP 14
cuṭu 14
cetayati 158
cetayate 158
cetayamānaṃ prayojayati 157, 158
cet-vārtika 92, 99
ceṣṭā 2, 49
copayati 155
chātraś chātram āhvayate 60
chidyate rajjuḥ svayam eva 146
jaṭābhir ālāpayate 136
jaṭilo bhīṣayate 133
jaṭilo vismāpayate 133
janayati 154
janayanti sukham 155
jāti 6
jānīte 144
jīvati 52
jugupsate 99, 102
jñāna 64, 65, 74, 75
jñāpaka 19
jñeya 74
ñaM 8
ñi 12
ṭavarga 14
ṭu 12, 13
ḍu 13
ṇit 18
taṇḍulān pacati 119
tadantavidhi 81
tadguṇasaṃvijñāna 105
tantra 10
tapas 82
tam adhicakre 62
tavarga 11
tān ārohayati mahāmātraḥ 131
tāyana 66, 67
tiṣṭhate·kanyā chātrebhyaḥ 48
tiṣṭhate vṛṣalī grāmaputrebhyaḥ 48
tU 11
tulyārtha 70
tṛtīyā 81
tṛtīyānta 81
tṛtīyāyukta 82
tṛtīyāyuktāt 81
tvatpādau spṛśāmi naitan mayā kṛtam 46
tvayi tiṣṭhate 48
thamu 11
dadāti 42
damayate 160
darśayati bhavaḥ 130
darśayate bhavaḥ 125, 127
darśayate bhṛtyai rājā 113
darśayate rājā svayam eva 114
darśayanti bhavaṃ bhaktāḥ 125, 127
daśagaṇī 1
das 42
dāsyā samprayacchate 83
didṛkṣate 85, 86
dṛśyate bhavaḥ 127
devadatta odanaṃ pacati 116, 118
devadatta odanam pācayati devadattena 116
devadatta odanaṃ pācayatyātmanā 116
devadattaḥ kaṭaṃ karoti 128
devadattaḥ sthālyāṃ pacati 118
devadattaṃ prati śuśrūṣate 88
devadattam / yajñadattam uparamati 152
devadattasya gāṃ jānāti 144
devadattādaya ādhyā abhirūpā darśanīyāḥ pakṣavantaḥ 3
devadatto yajñadattasya bhāryām upayacchati 84
devadatto rājānam darśayati bhṛtyaiḥ / bhṛtyān 117
devadatto hastinam ārohayati hastipakān 116
devadatto hastinam upasecayati hastipakaiḥ 117
devapūjāsaṃgatakaraṇa 50
dyati 42
dyutādi 164
dyotaka 34, 48, 68
dyotate 163

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

dravya 6
dvandvaṃ nyañci pātrāṇi prayunakti 107
dhanakāmo nyāyam apavadate 141
dhanuṣi śikṣate 45
dharmaṃ jijñāsate 85, 87
dhātu 1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 91
dhātubhakta 91
dhāpayete śiśum ekaṃ samīcī 159
dhvāṅkṣo vikurute svarān 63
na 39, 88, 160, 162, 163, 165, 166
nayate cārvī lokāyato 65
nartayate 160
naṣṭaṃ sumūrṣate 85
nāśayati duḥkham 155
nigaraṇa 154, 155
nigaraṇārtha 159
nigarayati 155
nitya 92, 94
nityatva 28, 92
nipāta 9
nipātana 2, 20, 22, 23
nimitta 28
niyama 27, 104, 105
niyamasūtra 26, 31
niyuṅkte 106
nirasyati 58
nirasyate 58
nirvartyakarman 119
niviviśate 101
niviśate 39
nivṛttapreṣaṇa 121, 128
nivṛttapreṣaṇapakṣa 130
niṣphalaṃ ceṣṭane 64
nihvayate 59
nṛtyati 52
neha pacyate 129
neha bhujyate 129
nyagbhavati 123
nyagbhavana 122, 123
nyagbhāvana 136
nyagbhāvanā 122, 123, 124
nyagbhāvayanti 123
nyaviśata 91, 93
pacati 5
pacanti pācakāḥ 140
pacyata odanaḥ svayam eva 123
pacyate 147
pacyate odanaḥ svayam eva 122
paṭapaṭāyate 161
paṭuyati 13
paṭhati 5
padaṃ mithyā kārayati 138
padaṃ mithyā kārayate 137
padaṃ mithyā vācayati 137
padaṃ suṣṭhu kārayati 137
paradārān prakurute 61
paravipratiṣedha 28
paraspara 38
parasparasya vyatipunanti 38
parasparasya vyatilunanti 38
parasmaipada 1, 26, 27, 29, 32, 89, 90
parākaroti 149
parākramate 68
parākriyate svayam eva 147
parācikīrṣati 99
parā jayati senā 41
parikrīḍate 45
parikrīṇīte 40
parigaṇana 1
paritrāṇārtham 11
paribhāṣā 94
paribhāṣāsūtra 19
parimāṇa 4
parimṛṣyati 151
parimohayate 160
pariramati 152
paryudāsa 42
paśyati bhavaḥ 125, 127, 130
paśyanti bhavaṃ bhaktāḥ 125, 126
paśyanti bhṛtyā rājānam 113, 114, 117
pāṇigrahaṇaviśiṣṭaṃ svakaraṇam 84
pāṇinā saṃprayacchati 84
pāda 1
pādavikaraṇe 70
pāyayate 160

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

pālana 108
pituḥ saṃjānāti 75
putram anujijñāsati 87
puruṣāḥ kurvanti 33
puruṣau kurutaḥ 33
pūjana 136
pūrva 98
pūrvatrāsiddham 25
pūrvam eva yajur uditam anuvadati 78
pūrvavat 98, 103
purvedyuḥ prakrāmati 71
paitṛkam aśvā anuharante 46
prakathana 60
prakarṣagati 9, 82, 140
prakāra 3, 46
prakāśana 47, 48
prakṛti 146
prakṛtiniyama 29, 146
prakṛtyarthaniyama 29, 30
pratikṣipati 149
pratijñāna 47, 80
pratijñāsvaritāḥ pāṇinīyāḥ 24
pratijñānunāsikyāḥ pāṇinīyāḥ 7
pratiprasava 148
pratiyatna 60, 61
pratiśuśrūṣati 88
pratiṣedha 37
pratiṣedhasūtra 87, 158
pratiṣṭhate 47
pratyaya 9, 100
pratyayaniyama 29, 31, 146
pratyāhāra 9, 10, 26, 104
pratyekaṃ cādiśabdaḥ parisamāpyate 3
prabhujati vāsasī 108
prameyaniścaya 65
prayuṅkte 106
prayogopādhī 65
prayojakakartṛ 115, 123, 124, 127, 132
prayojakavyāpārāntara 128
pralambhana 134
pravahataḥ 150
pravahati 150
praviśati 39, 147
prasajyapratiṣedha 42
prasahana 62
prasiddhy-upasaṃgraha 77
prāṇadhāraṇa 52
prātipadika 1, 2, 9
prāptavibhāṣā 78, 79
prāpyakarman 119
preraṇa 130
preṣaṇa 123, 124
phala 126, 140
bahuvi kriṇāti vanam 40
bālakam ullāpayati 136
bāṣpam uccarati 81
buddhyanuveśita 152
buddhyā vinayati 66
bodhayati 154
bodhayati padmam 155
brahman 3
brāhmaṇībhyaḥ saṃprayacchati 83
bhadre bhajasva mām idam te dāsyāmi 76
bhartāram upatiṣṭhatiyauvanena 50
bhāram udyacchate 143
bhāryām upayacchate 84
bhāva 17, 31, 32, 33, 34, 129, 145
bhāvavacana 3, 4, 5, 6
bhāvavacano dhātuḥ 3
bhāvavikārāḥ 3
bhāsana 75
bhikṣuko brāhmaṇakulam upatiṣṭhati or upatiṣṭhate 51
bhidyate kuśūlaḥ svayam eva 146
bhunakty enam agnir āhitaḥ 109
bhū- 3
bhūvā 4, 6, 30
bhṛti 64
bhojane bhojane sannidhīyate 53
bhojayati 155
bhvedhaspardha 1, 5
maṅgala 2
madrāḥ karaṃ vinayante 65
madhuno jānīte 74
madhuno nāthate 46
madhūni viśanti bhramarāḥ 39
mantraḥ karaṇam 50
mantrakaraṇa 50

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

mayi tiṣṭhate 48
mariṣyati 96
maryādā 42
mallo mallam āhvayate 60
mahāmantrān upatiṣṭhate 51
mahāvyākṛti 2
mahiyayati 100, 101
mahīyate 100
māṇavakam anu krīḍati 45
māṇavakam udānayate 65
māṇavakam upanayate 65
māṇavakaṃ gardhayate 134
māṇavakaṃ vañcayate 134
mātuḥ saṃjānāti 75
mātṛkam gāvo' nuharante 46
māyā 3
mā samṛṣātām 58
mit 160
mithyāphalākhyāna 134
mīmāṃsate 99, 102
muṇḍo bhīṣayate 133
mumūrṣati 101, 102
mṛ- 3
mṛṣiṣṭa 97
megho varṣati 52
mriyante 95
mriyete 95
yajate 140
yajanti yājakāḥ 140
yajuḥsv asya kramate buddhiḥ 67
yajñadatta odanaṃ pācayati devadattena116
yajñadattaḥ kaṭaṃ kārayati devadattena 129
yajñadattāya śapate 46
yata evakāras tato' nyatra niyamaḥ 29
yatna 75
yathāsaṁkhyam 24
yā 2
yāvadbhuktam upatiṣṭhate 53
yāvadbhuktam uparamati/uparamate 153
yogavibhāga 24, 111
yodhayati kāṣṭhāni 155
racayate 160
rajaka 13
rajakī 13
rathikān upatiṣṭhate 50
rājā rājānaṃ darśayati bhṛtyaiḥ/bhṛtyān 117
rājātmānaṃ darṣayate 117
rājānaḥ 35
rājānam upatiṣṭhati 53
rūpeṇa vismāyayati 133
laḥ kartari 32
laḥ karmaṇi 32
lakāra 20, 93
lakṣaṇā 26, 127
laśaku 15
lāvayati dātraṃ svam eva 131
liṅgātideśa 99
lunāti dātreṇa 131
lūyate kedāraḥ svayam 32
lopa 16
lohitāyati/te 161
vat I, 97
vadate cārvī lokāyate 76
varatanu saṃpravadanti kukkuṭāḥ 77
vartate 165
vartiṣyate 164
vartsyati 164
vastram āyacchate 143
vahati bhāram 52
vā 18, 71, 160, 163 ,165, 166
vācaka 48
vācā śarīrasparśanam 46
vādayate 160
vāsayate 160
vikaraṇa 27, 28, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 112
vikaraṇavyavadhāne'pi niyamapravṛttiḥ 27
vikaraṇebhyo niyamo balīyān 27, 90, 94
vikāryakarman 119
vikāsana 43
vikurvate saindhavāḥ 64
vikusmayate 100
vikrīṇīte 40
viklitti 126
viklittyanukūlavyāpāra 126
vikṣepa 70
vigaṇana 64, 65

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

vicitrās taddhitavṛttayaḥ 84
vitapate 54
vid 3
vidyācuñcu 14
vidyām ādatte 43
vidyāsu śikṣate 45
vidhi 104, 105
vidhisūtra 15, 34
vidheya 1, 8, 11, 12, 24
vināśa 152
vinimaya 35
viniyuṅkte 106
viniyoga 24
vipādikām vyādadāti 43
vipratiṣedha 28
viprayoga 108, 109
vipralāpe 79
vipravadanti śakunayaḥ 79
vipravadante/vipravadanti mauhūrtāḥ 79
vipravadante/vipravadanti sāṃvatsarāḥ 79
vibhakti 11
vibhaktiviparināma 16, 132, 134
vibhāga 43
vibhāṣā 78, 79, 153, 160, 162, 166
vimati 75
viramati 152
vivakṣā 117, 121
vivardhiṣate 165
viśeṣaṇa 83
viśeṣadarśana 120
visaṃvādana 134
viharaṇa 70
vuñchaṇ 18
vṛtādi 164
vṛtta 19
vṛttanimittaka 19
vṛtti 66, 67, 72
vṛddhi 17, 19
vṛdbhyaḥ 163
vṛṣalyā saṃprayacchate 83
vyaktavāc 77
vyatigacchanti 37
vyatighnanti 37
vyatijalpanti 37
vyatipaṭhanti 37
vyatireka 5
vyatisarpanti 37
vyatihanyante dasyavaḥ 36
vyatihasanti 37
vyatihāre 35
vyadyotiṣṭa 163
vyaya 65
vyavasitapāṭha 19
vyavasitāntyam 9
vyavasthā 3
vyavasthitavibhāṣā 136
vyākaraṇādhyayanāya kramate 67
vyākrīṇīta 91
vyādadate pipīlikāḥ pataṅgamukham 43
vyāpāra 3, 126
śataṃ prakurute 61
śataṃ pratijānīte 75
śataṃ vinayate 65
śataṃ saṃjānīte 75
śatena saṃgirate 80
śabdataḥ 23
śarīrātman 113
śāyayati 100
śāyayati devadattam 157
śālīnīkaraṇa 136
śāstravākyāni 7
śit vikaraṇa 89
śitaḥ 89, 90
śiśatsati 101
śiśayiṣate 101
śīyate 94
śete 30, 146
śete devadattaḥ 157
śeṣa 145
śeṣe 30
śoṣayate vrīhīn ātapaḥ 158
śyeno vartikām udākurute 61
śyeno vartikām ullāpayate 136
śruta 82
śvānaṃ gardhayati 134
ṣaṣṭhīsuṭau 61
saṃyacchati 148
saṃvitte 57
saṃvivahante gargaiḥ 37
saṃśayya karṇādiṣu tiṣṭhate yaḥ 48

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

saṃśṇute 57, 58
saṃsarga 108, 109
saṃsvarate 58
saṃhitāpāṭha 44
saṃhvayate 59
sakarmaka 74, 154
sakāram ātiṣṭhate 47
saṃkrāmati 68, 72
saṃkrīḍate 45
saṃkṣṇute 107
saṃkṣṇuvate śastram 107
saṃkṣṇuvāte 107
saṃgacchate 57
saṃgatakaraṇa 51
saṃgirati grāsam 80
saṃgharṣa 59
saṃjñāsūtra 1, 6, 10, 12
saṃtiṣṭhate 47
saṃdarśana 74
samaranta 57
samartha 70
samārtha 70
samāhāradvandva 15
samuccāraṇa 79
samṛcchiṣyate 57
samṛta 58
saṃpaśyate 58
saṃpṛcchate 57
saṃpravadante kṣatriyāḥ 77
saṃpravadante brāhmaṇāḥ 77, 79
saṃpraharante 35
saṃpraharante rājānaḥ 37
sambandha 71
saṃmānana 64, 136
sahayukta 83
sahasraṃ pratijānīte 75
sahasraṃ saṃjānīte 75
sahasram apajānīte 73
sarga 66, 67
sarpiṣā upāyena pravartate 74
sarpiṣo jānīte 74
sarpiṣo nāthate 46
sarvādeśa 18
savatsā dhenur ānīyatāṃ sakiśorā sakarabhā sabarkarā 108
sādhana 121
sādhu dāntāḥ śobhanaṃ valganti 64
sādhu vikramate 70
sādhya 6
sāmarthya 13, 26, 44, 48, 71, 73, 76, 79, 88, 108, 159
sāmānādhikaraṇya 33
sāmīpya 10
sārvadhātuka 90, 93
sārvadhātuka vikaraṇa 27
sāhasikya 60
siddha 6, 92, 94
supyate bhavatā 32
sumūrṣate 86
suṣṭhu vikramate 70
sevana 60
stu 20
sthalam 111
sthānin 18, 22
sthānivadbhāva 12, 29, 93
sthālī pacati 118, 121
sthālyā pacati 121
sthālyāṃ pacati 121
stheya 48
stheyākhyā 47
spardhāyām 59
sphītatā 67
smarati vanagulmasya kokilaḥ 112, 132
smarayaty enam vanagulmaḥ svayam eva 111, 113, 132
svaṃ śaṭakāntam upayacchati 84
svakaraṇa 84
svaṃ kaṭam karoti/kurute 145

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

svatantrakartṛ 32
svaṃ putram apavadati/apavadate 145
svarita 24, 26, 149, 150
svareṇa putram jānāti 74
svargaṃ lokaṃ na prajānāti mūḍhaḥ 144
svādhyāyād uparamate 152
svābhiprāyakathanam 48
svīkaraṇa 84
svīkṛtapreṣaṇa 128
hanty ātmānam 113
hal 8
hastī hastinam ārohayati hastipakān 116
hastī hastinam upasecayati hastipakaiḥ 117
hasty ātmānam ārohayate 116
hasty ātmānam upasecayate 117
hiṃsā 36
hitān na yaḥ saṃśṛṇute sa kiṃprabhuḥ 52
ḥrnīyayati 100, 101
hṛṇīyate 100
hetumat 100, 110, 127, 142, 157

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

INDEX OF ENGLISH TERMS

abbreviative designation 9, 27, 104
actual language 16
adhikāra–device 25
agent 121
agreement 5
alba 77
ancient controversy 2
associative digression 83, 96, 153
augment 91, 92, 93
auxiliary 104, 105
backward 24
base 5
basic concept 2
basic element 2
benediction 96
boundary marker 43
case ending 17
causative 110, 115, 119, 130
causative verb 112
causativizatiou 118
clue 113
cock 77
common phonetic elements 5
conflict 26, 28, 91, 92, 93, 94
conflict–solving principle 28
contrast 5
co–occuring word 35
co–referential 126
desiderative 2
desiderative base 87, 98
desiderative suffix 85
desire 96
dissimilar 5
distinctive feature 100
division of the *sūtras* 1
element immediately before 35
enumeration 1
ergative 119, 131
ergative construction 115
extreme ease 32, 124
finite verb endings 89
fixed arrangement 3
formal indication 68
general derivability 2
genitive 90
good luck 2
grammatical categories 6
grammatical meanings 34
grammatical operations 17
grammatical principles 92
great utterances 2
handle in the car handles well 131
homogenous 11, 15
homonymic form 2
idiomatic meaning 119
impersonal action 30, 31, 32
incompatible item 25
inherent capacities 121
interpretation 90
intervening element 39
intervention 91
intransitive 31, 55, 74, 154
intransitive verb 107
intransitively 73, 77, 119
John causes himself to cook the rice 116
John causes John to cook the rice 116
John cooks the rice 115
John shaves himself 115
John shaves John 115
karmakartṛ–construction 113
lack of scope 30
later addition 166
limit 98
linguistic environment 92
linguistic form 92
linguistic term 2

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

locative 35
mark 100
marker 100
meaning–condition 23, 35, 72
meaning–explanation 1
multi–purpose word 44
multipurposiveness 10
niyama character 96
non–causative 111, 112, 115, 118, 119, 130
non–causative verb 110
non–pāṇiniyan, 1
non–periphrastic future 164
non–reflexive matrix sentence 115
non–*sannanta* base 99
one–to–one correspondence 20
ordinary language 17
part 18
periphrastic future 166
periphrastic perfect 104
perplexity 17
persona ending 11
Peter causes John to cook the rice 115
philosophy of grammar 6
pitch distinction 7
post-pāṇinian 104
postpositions 45
precative 96
precative middle 97
precedence 91
predicate 1
preferably 18, 164
preferably not 162
pre–pāṇinian 2
prescriptive rule 104
preverb 68, 91
primitive base 98
prolixity 30
prompted agent 115
prompting agent 115
qualified correlative 83
qualifier 83
qualifier–qualified relation 88
readymade form 2
reciprocity 35
redundant 26
reflexive 115
reflexive causative 110
reflexive sense 110, 115
reflexivization 118
refutation 92
remainder 145
representation in language 32
representation in reality 32
respective order 20
restriction 94
restrictive rule 91, 104
revealer 34
rule imposing a restriction 31
rule–ordering 91
sannanta base 99
sarvādeśa–rule 18
section heading rule 24
semantic criterion 119
semantic meaning 34
sentence–structure 115
shortcoming 17
siddha principle 28
simultaneously applicable 91
starting–point 2
stem–suffix analysis 2
subgroup 1
subject 1
subjectwise division 25
substitute 23
substitution 16
suffix 5
supposition 92
svarita marked 25

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

svarita-pitch 25
synonym 2
synonymous 80
(syntactic) connection 71
tag–letter 7
tampered 100
technical language of grammar 7
technical usage 16
the car handles well 127
traditional interpretation 104
transference of the marker 99
transferred application 97
transformational approach 114
transformational point 110
transitive 31, 55, 74, 154
transitive verb 107, 119
transitively 87
two separate rules 68
two–way conflict 92
type 3
verbal base 1, 2, 91
whole 18
widened 2
word derivation 2
word or words whose presence as a co–occurring word conditions grammatical operation 35

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji

CC.0 Digitized by Arya Samaj Foundation, Chennai and eGangotri

Vidya Niwas Mishra Collection, Varanasi. Courtesy. Dayanidhi Mishra ji